

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Appeal No.261 of 2025

The Branch Manager, ICICI Lombard GIC Ltd., At 2nd Floor, Krishna Bhawan, Dakbanglow Road, Patna, Appeal and Appellant through Authorized Signatory/Duly Constituted Attorney, ICICI Lombard General Insurance Company Limited, 2nd Floor, Krishna Bhawan, Above Axis Bank, Near Dakbanglow Crossing, Patna-1.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. Fuliya Devi Wife of Late Randhir Sahni, Resident of Village- Randaha, P.O.- Balatarh, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
2. Devanand Sahni Son of Late Randhir Sahni, Resident of Village- Randaha, P.O.- Balatarh, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
3. Mala Kumari Son of Late Randhir Sahni, Resident of Village- Randaha, P.O.- Balatarh, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
4. Nitish Kumar Son of Late Randhir Sahni, Resident of Village- Randaha, P.O.- Balatarh, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
5. Ram Ashray Sahni Son of Late Randhir Sahni, Resident of Village- Randaha, P.O.- Balatarh, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
6. Babni Devi Wife of Ram Ashray Sahni, Resident of Village- Randaha, P.O.- Balatarh, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
7. Uday Kumar Singh Son of Baleshwar Singh, Resident of Village and P.O.- Salha, P.S.- Jandaha, District- Vaishali. (Owner).
8. Nagendra Rai Son of Raghunandan Rai, Resident of Village and P.O.- Rahimapur, P.S.- Bidupur, District- Vaishali, (Driver).

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Durgesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s :

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 08-01-2026 Heard Mr. Durgesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel for
the appellant and the State.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief/s:

(i) being aggrieved by and dissatisfied with



the Judgment/Award dated 13.08.2024, passed by Smt. Jyoti Kumari, Additional District Judge-7- Cum-Motor Accident Claim Tribunal, Vaishali at Hajipur (hereinafter referred to as the Tribunal), in Claim Case no. 18/20 'Fuliya Devi and Ors. v/s Uday Kumar Singh and Ors.' by which compensation has been allowed against the appellant.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant prays for withdrawal of the petition submitting that it has now become infructuous.

4. Accordingly, the same is dismissed as infructuous.

5. The statutory amount, if any, has to be returned to the Company.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

