

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

1. C.W.P No. 2898 of 1995 (O&M)

Net Ram Petitioner

Vs.

Commissioner, Rohtak Division, Rohtak & Ors. Respondents

2. COCP No. 2257 of 2009

Net Ram Petitioner

Vs.

Rajinder Singh Respondent

Date of Decision: 29.09.2016

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE DR. SHEKHER DHAWAN**

Present: - None for the petitioner.

Ms. Kirti Singh, DAG, Haryana.

MAHESH GROVER, J.(ORAL)

On the previous date i.e. on 30.11.2011, the following order was
passed in C.W.P No. 2898 of 1995 :-

“C.M No. 1654 of 2010

*This application has been filed by the petitioner for
impleading one Rajinder Singh son of Sh. Karan Singh,
resident of Village Nangal Kalan, Tehsil and District Sonapat,
as respondent No.7.*

No one is present on behalf of the applicant-petitioner.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

C.M No. 5327 of 2010

This application has been filed for summoning of respondent No.7 who has yet not been impleaded as respondent.

No one is present on behalf of the applicant- petitioner.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.”

On 12.09.2011, also there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Similar was the position on 24.05.2004, 20.07.2004, 13.09.2004, 18.08.2010, 24.09.2010, 29.11.2010, 01.02.2011, 08.02.2011 and 16.03.2011. We are, therefore, of the opinion that there is no serious prosecution of the case by the petitioner as is clear from the repeated defaults committed by the learned counsel for the petitioner in both the cases.

Consequently both, the petitions are dismissed for want of prosecution.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

(SHEKHER DHAWAN)
JUDGE

September 29, 2016
tripti

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No
Whether reportable - Yes/No