

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.88-89 OF 2011

RAJASTHAN STATE ROAD TRANSPORT  
CORPORATION

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

VAIBHAV KUMAR

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.90-91 OF 2011

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.92-93 OF 2011

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.94 OF 2011

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.95-96 OF 2011

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.97-98 OF 2011

CIVIL APPEAL NO.99 OF 2011

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by  
NEETU KHAJURIA  
Date: 2015.02.21

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.104-105 OF 2011

12:24:29 IST

Reason:

2

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.108-109 OF 2011

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.114-115 OF 2011

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.117-118 OF 2011

O R D E R

1. Heard learned Counsel for the parties to  
the lis and perused the documents on record.

Civil Appeal Nos.88-89, 90-91,92-93,94, 95-96,  
97-98, 99, 104-105, 108-109, 114-115 of 2011

2. In this batch of appeals, the High Court of Rajasthan at Jaipur has followed the judgment and order passed by it in D.B. Civil Special Appeal No. 10 of 2006, R.S.R.T.C. v. Vaibhav Kumar And Ors., dated 08.03.2011 (Civil Appeal Nos. 88-89 of 2011 before us), whereby and whereunder, the High Court has dismissed the special appeal filed before it on the grounds of being non-maintainable under Section 100-A of the

3

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (for short, "the Code").

3. The High Court in passing the impugned judgment and order in Civil Appeal Nos.88-89 of 2011 has considered the cut-off date, i.e., 01.07.2002, whereafter Section 100-A of the Code stood amended to the effect that no special appeal from an order passed by the Single Judge in appeal under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, was maintainable before it.

4. In view of the reasons recorded by the High Court, we find no good ground to interfere with the impugned order passed by the High Court.

Civil Appeal NOS.117-118 OF 2011

5. In view of the smallness of amount involved, we are not inclined to interfere with the impugned order passed by the High Court.

4

6. Accordingly, all the civil appeals are dismissed. However, the question of law raised in these appeals is kept open to be agitated in an



CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. SIKRI  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MISHRA

For Appellant(s) Mr. Puneet Jain, Adv.  
Ms. Khushbu Jain, Adv.  
Mr. Abhinav Gupta, Adv.  
Mr. Christi Jain, Adv.  
Ms. Chhaya Kirti, Adv.  
For Ms. Pratibha Jain, Adv.  
  
Mr. S. K. Bhattacharya, Adv.  
  
Mr. R. Balasubramanian, Adv.  
Ms. Rashmi Malhotra, Adv.  
For Mr. B.V. Balramdas, Adv.  
For Mrs. Anil Katiyar, Adv.  
  
Mr. K. L. Janjani, Adv.  
  
Mr. H.D. Thanvi, Adv.  
For Mr. Sarad Kumar Singhania, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. S. K. Bhattacharya, Adv.  
  
Mr. S. K. Verma, Adv.  
  
Mr. Rajeev Kumar Bansal, Adv.  
  
Ms. Nidhi Jaswal, Adv.  
Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Adv.  
  
Mr. K.K. Tyagi, Adv.  
Mr. Iftexhar Ahmad, Adv.  
Mr. P. Narasimhan, Adv.  
  
Mr. I.V. Kasyap, Adv.  
For Mrs. K. Sarada Devi, Adv.  
  
Ms. Neerja Sachdeva, Adv.  
For Mr. Parmanand Gaur, Adv.  
7

Mr. Ashwani Garg, Adv.  
Mr. Vijay Kumar, Adv.

Ms. Mahalakshmi Pavani, Adv.  
Mr. G. Balaji, Adv.  
For M/s. Mahalakshmi Balaji & Co.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

The appeals are dismissed in terms of  
the signed order.

Pending application(s), if any, stand  
disposed of.

(Neetu Khajuria)  
Sr.P.A.

(Vinod Kulvi)  
Assistant Registrar

(Signed order is placed on the file.)