IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Misc. Appeal No. 378 of 2014

Oriental Insurance Company Limited having its Divisional Office at City Centre, Sector 4, Bokaro Steel City, District-Bokaro through its Incharge, Legal Cell, Shri Alok Kumar Singh, son of Suresh Kumar, having its office at Lalpur, P.O.-Lalpur, P.S.-Lalpur, District Ranchi

…. ….. Appellant/ Opposite Party 5

Versus

1. Nageshwar Mahato, S/O Late Khadi Ram Mahato, R/O Village-Raghunathpur, P.O Vagda, P.S. Kasmar, District-Bokaro, Jharkhand
… … Respondent/Claimant 1
2. Punia Devi, W/O Nageshwar Mahato, R/O Village-Raghunathpur, P.O Vagda, P.S.-Kasmar, District-Bokaro, Jharkhand.
… …. Respondent/Claimant 2
3. Rashmi Ranjan Kumar, S/O Surendra Prasad, Resident of Dinesh Prasad Road No. 4, Postal Park, Patna, P.O & P.S.-Mithapur, District-Patna, Bihar, currently resident of Ram Chandrapura Mangala Asthan, Bihar Sharif, P.O, P.S. and District Nalanda, Bihar
… …. Owner of BR1PA 3583/Opposite Party 1
4. Ram Pravesh Singh, S/O Bahali Singh, Resident of Dhakai, P.O.-Bithosrif, P.S.-Chandoli, District-Gaya, currently resident of BSL, L.H.M.N.-86, Street-7, Bokaro Steel PO+PS+ City District-Bokaro, Jharkhand.
… … Driver of BRIPA 3583/Opposite Party 2
5. Sri Ram Roadways, I/C Sunil Poddar, Sri Gopal Complex, 4th Floor, Kutchery Road, P.O. G.P.O, P.S. Kotwali, Ranchi, Jharkhand.
… … Owner of JH01Z 2838/Opposite Party 3
6. Ajit Munda, S/O Ganesh Munda, Chakrawali, P.O.-Maganpur, P.S.-Gola, District-Ramgarh, Jharkhand.
… … Driver of JH01Z 2838/Opposite Party 4
7. Manager, IFFCO-TOKIO, General Insurance Co. Ltd., Fortune Plaza, Flat No.-210A, Near Ashok Nagar, Road No-4, Argora, P.O. Ashok Nagar, PS-Argora, Ranchi, Jharkhand.
… …. Respondent/Opposite Party 6

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

For the Appellant: Ms Adya Mishra, Advocate
For the Resp. No. 5&7: Mr Ashutosh Anand, Advocate
For the Resp. No. 6: Mr Santosh Kumar, Advocate
Mr Tarun Kumar Mahato, Advocate

---

06 / Dated: 06.11.2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Ms Adya Mishra submits that service is complete upon all the respondents in this matter.
3. By following the reasoning in the judgment and order disposing of connected M.A. No. 377 of 2014, even this appeal is partly allowed.
4. The impugned award is modified by directing that the appellant-Insurance Company must first pay the compensation amount to the claimants and after such payment, would be entitled to recover this amount from the owner i.e. the 3rd respondent herein.
5. This appeal is partly allowed to the above extent without any order for costs.
6. Pending I.A., if any, will not survive and are disposed of.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

November 06, 2026

Ranjeet/CP-2
NAFR
Uploaded on 06.11.2026