

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

RSA No.695 of 1989

Date of Decision: 17.02.2016

Gaje Singh and others

... Appellants

Versus

Dharma

... Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: None for the appellants.

Mr. Chander Pal, Advocate
for the respondent

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

As per office report, notices issued to appellants No.1, 2 and 4 have been received back duly served. Notice issued to appellant No.3 received back with report that he is not residing at the given address. No one has appeared on behalf of served appellants. Correct address of appellant No.3 cannot be given by anyone as the learned counsel for the respondent has pleaded his ignorance about the correct address of appellant No.3.

In view of aforesaid, since, there is no representation on behalf of the appellants, this Court is left with no alternative but to dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution.

Dismissed for want of prosecution.

17.02.2016

prince

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE