

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

FAO No. 3417 of 2007 (O&M)
Date of decision : April 12, 2016

Imran Ali,

..... Petitioner

v.

Dev Singh and another,

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Abhinav Sood, Advocate
for Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

1. **Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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 ?**

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

On 1.7.2014, the following order was passed :-

“ Learned counsel for the appellant submits that despite his best efforts, he could not contact the appellant and obtain fresh addresses of the respondents and he may be granted another opportunity to try and obtain the same.

On his request, adjourned to 6.8.2014.

In the meanwhile, in case learned counsel for the appellants provides fresh addresses of the respondents, let notice be issued to them.”

Thereafter, on 6.8.2014, the following order was passed :-

“ Process for service of respondents No.1 and 2 could not be issued as counsel for the appellant failed to provide latest addresses of the respondents despite grant of last opportunity.

Adjourned sine die with liberty to the appellant to get it revived as and when he is able to get the latest

addresses of the respondents.”

The matter has been listed today and despite passage of more than one and half year, correct addresses of respondents No.1 and 2 have not been furnished. Even today, counsel for the petitioner seeks more time. I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by giving more time. In the circumstances, this appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.

April 12, 2016
`kk'

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE