

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.3679 of 2002

Date of Decision.10.04.2015

Devi Chand

.....Petitioner

Versus

Ram Chander and another

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Kamal Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The counsel for the petitioner says that in spite of letters and the registered notices, the petitioner has not turned up to instruct him. Registry has also reported that the costs directed to be paid through the order of this Court on 23.01.2015 has not been paid. I do not think that there is any purpose in keeping the civil revision against an interim order pending at this stage.

2. The civil revision is dismissed for default of appearance and non-prosecution.

3. The counsel for the petitioner seeks for liberty for approaching the Court which is wholly unnecessary. It is for him to convince the Court that there were circumstances that justified his absence but the registry will not entertain any application for restoration if the direction for payments of costs already made is not complied with. I impose additional costs of ₹ 5,000/- to be also

deposited if there were to be fresh consideration of his application for restoration.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

April 10, 2015
Pankaj*