

Sr. No.218

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

CWP-17786-2009(O&M)

Date of Decision: December 12, 2016

Krishan Kumar

.....Petitioner

VS.

Chandigarh Administration and others

....Respondents

**CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH**

Present:- Mr. Kunal Mulwanni, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Suvir Sehgal, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Shiv Kumar Goyal, Advocate for U.T, Chandigarh
Mr.Animesh Sharma, Advocate for the respondents no.3 to 5.

-.-

MAHESH GROVER, J

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has sold his share and thus, has no interest in the property. He further states that he has no instructions to prosecute the petition.

Consequently, as there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner and the said person having sold his interest in the property, we deem it appropriate to dismiss the petition for want of prosecution with, however, liberty to the person who purchased the share to raise his cause in the event of his having any surviving interest in the petition by reviving it.

**(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE**

**(DARSHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

December 12, 2016
mamta

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No