

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CR 2272 of 2020

Date of Decision: September 30, 2020

Simranjit Kaur and othersPetitioners
Versus
Reliance General Insurance Co. Ltd. and others .. Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present : Mr. Rajiv Kumar Saini, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Varun Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Ashwani Talwar, Advocate
for the respondents.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J. (Oral)

The matter has been taken up through
video-conferencing on account of outbreak of pandemic COVID-
19.

The instant petition by disgruntled petitioners
Simranjit Kaur, Manvinder Kaur and Gur Loveleen Kaur against
principal respondent Reliance General Insurance Company is
whereby challenge has been laid to interim orders Annexures
P-6 to P-10.

Upon hearing the counsel, the Motor Accident

Claims Tribunal (for short, the Tribunal) vide award dated 24.03.1997 disposed off the claim petition of the claimants present petitioners thereby the Tribunal had awarded compensation amount of Rs.24,83,464/- to the claimants.

Upon non-fulfilment of the obligations arising out of the award in paying compensation to the claimants, the Executing Court had vide order dated 02.08.2018 ordered the release of the amount so deposited during the execution amounting to Rs.28,84,520/- subject to furnishing of adequate security after the claimant applicants had filed an application for release of the cheque so deposited by JD/Insurance Company.

During the course of execution proceedings, the impugned orders Annexures P-6 to P10 were passed by the Court calling upon two sides to file their respective calculations of the amount so due and it is against these very orders the present petitioners have come about in this petition.

The claim of the claimants on the basis of the award stands duly complied with whereby the Insurance Company as is reflected from the order dated 02.08.2018 amount of award stands duly deposited and the Court had ordered release of the amount subject to furnishing of requisite security, however, the same was never furnished by the applicant decree holder present petitioners and in stead has devised a way out to challenge the entire orders inviting furnishing of respective

calculations by the JD as well as by the decree holders through orders P-6 to P-10. To the specific query of the Court, counsel for the petitioners could not convince what prejudice has come about by these orders which are mere interim in nature for furtherance of the proceedings in execution application culminating into passing of final order. Rather what one can visualize, counsel for the present petitioners without there being any legal necessity to assail such orders nor any prejudice having been caused to them much less any illegality or perversity filed the instant revision. Such a conduct certainly needs to be deprecated whereby this Court has been unnecessarily burdened and this Court taking a lenient view does not feel appropriate and restrains itself to impose costs. The revision petition, thus, stands dismissed.

September 30, 2020
amit rana

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking :	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No