

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 22470/2026  
[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 06-05-2026  
in FA No. 1992/2026 passed by the High Court of Gujarat at  
Ahmedabad]

M/S ICICI LOMBARD GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SANJAYBHAI PRAVINBHAI JADAV & ANR. Respondent(s)

(IA No. 186039/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED  
JUDGMENT

IA No. 186040/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 09-07-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN  
(PARTIAL COURT WORKING DAYS BENCH)

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Gagan Gupta, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Suraj Raj Keshernani, Adv.  
Mr. Karun Sharma, AOR  
Mr. Mayank Raj, Adv.  
Mr. Shubham Kumar, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

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

1. The present Special Leave Petition has been filed against the judgment and order dated 06.05.2026 passed by the High Court of Gujarat at Ahmedabad<sup>1</sup> in R/First Appeal No. 1992 of 2026. By the impugned judgment and order, the High Court dismissed the first appeal preferred by the petitioner, thereby affirming the award passed by the Motor Accident Claims

---

1 In short, "High Court"

Tribunal (Main), Rajkot<sup>2</sup> awarding compensation of Rs. 2,85,920/- to the claimant for the injuries sustained in the motor accident that occurred on 04.03.2017.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that the High Court failed to adjudicate the substantial issues raised in the appeal concerning the alleged fraudulent implication of the insured vehicle and its driver, the unexplained delay in registration of the FIR, contradictory identification of the driver in the claimant's own complaints, admissions made by the eye-witness during cross-examination, and material inconsistencies appearing in the claimant's medical records. It was submitted that instead of examining these issues, the High Court dismissed the appeal merely on the ground that the compensation awarded was meagre. According to the learned senior counsel, such an approach is contrary to the settled principles governing the exercise of appellate jurisdiction, particularly when the issues raised go to the very root of the insurer's liability.

3. We have heard the learned senior counsel for the petitioner and perused the material placed on record.

4. We are not impressed with the manner in which the High Court has dealt with the appeal. Nevertheless, we find that the Tribunal, upon a comprehensive appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence on record, rendered a detailed and reasoned award dealing with all the issues raised by the parties and ultimately held the petitioner liable to pay

---

2 In short, "Tribunal"

compensation of Rs. 2,85,920/- together with interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of claim petition till realization. In the facts and circumstances of the case, we are not inclined to interfere with the award passed by the Tribunal, as affirmed by the judgment and order of the High Court.

5. Accordingly, the Special Leave Petition is dismissed.

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

(RADHA SHARMA)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(AVGV RAMU)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)