

204

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

**RSA-3716-2008 (O&M)
Date of decision : 28.07.2016**

M.C. Kharkhoda

... Appellant

Versus

Jai Bhagwan and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: None for the appellant.

Mr. Roopak Bansal, Advocate
for respondent Nos.1 and 4.

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?

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

This case has been remanded back to this Court by Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 18.07.2011. Thereafter, learned counsel for the appellant has not submitted the application for impleading the LRs of respondent Nos.2 and 3. Time and again, learned counsel for the appellant seeks adjournment and last opportunity has been granted vide order dated 02.02.2016. Thereafter, learned counsel for the appellant was directed to to the needful within two weeks subject to the payment of ₹ 1100/- as costs.

Now, as per office report, learned counsel for the appellant has neither complied with the orders dated 02.02.2016 and 19.05.2016 nor there

is any representation on behalf of the appellant. It appears that the appellant is not interested in pursuing the matter.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

28.07.2016
yogesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

	✓
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/ No
Whether Reportable	Yes/ No