

The Manager vs Arun Kumar T

The Manager vs Arun Kumar T

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1538929

Court : Karnataka

Decided On : Apr-07-2026

Judge : Sachin Shankar Magadum

Appeal No. : WP/10900/2026

Appellant : The Manager

Respondent : Arun Kumar T

Judgement :

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026 BEFORE THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM WRIT PETITION NO. 10900 OF 2026 (GM-AC) BETWEEN: THE MANAGER SHRIRAM GIC LTD, TP HUB, NO.3/5, 3RD FLOOR, S.V. ARCADE, BELEKAHALLI MAIN ROAD, OFF BANNERGHATTA ROAD, IIM-B POST, BANGALORE- 560076 REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGER PRADEEP D.S COMPANY REGISTERED UNDER INSURANCE ACT-1938 PETITIONER (BY SRI. B. PRADEEP., ADVOCATE) Digitally signed AND: by SHARADAVANI B Location: High 1. ARUN KUMAR T Court of

S/O. AJITH KUMAR R, Karnataka AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS, R/AT NO. H-12, SHRIRAM SADHANA APARTMENTS, GOKULA EXTN, MATHIKERE, BENGALURU NORTH, BENGALURU-560054 ALSO R/AT. H.NO.332 A, CHANDRANAGAR EXTN. COLONY, PALAKKAD, KERALA-678007. -2-

2. ANANDA C.N, S/O, NRASIMHEGOWDA, MAJOR, R/AT NO.336, RAJARAJESHWARI NAGARA, BANGALORE-560098.

3. MUNIYAPPA, S/O NOT KNOWN, MAJOR, R/AT. NO.104, BANNERGHATTA, BENGALURU RURAL-560083. RESPONDENTS THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF

THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO BE PLEASED TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT OR DIRECTION TO QUASH THE ORDERS DATED 03-11-2025 PASSED ON IA NO. 1V COURT OF XXII ADDL. SMALL CAUSES JUDGE, BENGALURU. IN M.V.C. NO. 2621/2024 AT ANNEXURE A., AND ETC. THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER: CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

ORAL ORDER

The captioned writ petition is filed by the Insurance Company calling in question the order dated 03.11.2025 passed by the XXII Additional Small Causes Judge, Bengaluru in M.V.C.No.2621/2024, whereby the Tribunal has proceeded with the adjudication of the claim petition notwithstanding the contention of the petitioner that the -3- claim petition itself is barred by limitation, having been instituted beyond the prescribed period of six months.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner-

Insurance Company submits that the Tribunal has committed an error in proceeding with the claim petition despite the admitted fact that the claim petition

has been filed beyond the statutory period of six months. In support of his contention, learned counsel has placed reliance on a

judgment rendered by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court,

wherein the question relating to the maintainability of claim petitions filed beyond the prescribed period and the applicability of Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, for condonation of delay in such matters has been examined.

3. Having examined the judgment relied upon by the

learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is informed that the very same question, namely, whether a belated claim petition under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 can be entertained by invoking Section 5 of the -4- Limitation Act, 1963 for condonation of delay beyond the statutory period, is presently under consideration before the Honble Apex Court in Special Leave to Appeal (C) Nos.8412-8413 of 2023. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that in several similar matters, Co-ordinate Benches of this Court, while taking note of the pendency of the aforesaid Special Leave Petitions before the Honble Supreme Court, have disposed of writ petitions with an observation that the pendency of the matter before the Hon'ble Apex Court shall not come in the way of the Tribunal proceeding with the adjudication of the claim petitions. However, the Tribunal has been directed to defer the pronouncement of the final judgment and award until the issue regarding maintainability of such belated claim petitions is authoritatively decided by the Honble Supreme Court.

4. In the light of the consistent view taken by the

Co-ordinate Benches of this Court and bearing in mind that the issue concerning the maintainability of claim petitions -5- filed beyond the period of six months is presently sub judice before the Honble Apex Court, this Court deems it appropriate to adopt the same course. Accordingly, the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal is directed to proceed with the adjudication of the claim petition on merits.

5. However, the Tribunal shall refrain from

pronouncing the final judgment and award until the Honble Supreme Court renders its decision in the aforesaid Special Leave Petitions concerning the maintainability of claim petitions filed beyond the prescribed period of limitation. With these observations and directions, the writ petition stands disposed of. Sd/- (SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM) JUDGE GJM List No.: 3 SI No.: 5

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com