

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

FAO No.M-166 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of decision: July 29, 2016

Ashish Kumar

..... Appellant

Versus

Promila

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. JEYAPPAUL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

Present:- Mr. Vijay Saini, Advocate, for
Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Advocate
for the appellant.

None for the respondent.

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?

M. JEYAPPAUL, J. (ORAL)

CM-8470-CII-2016

This is an application praying for restoration of the appeal which was dismissed in default on 07.04.2016.

We issued notice to the respondent. Respondent has been served through notice for the hearing on 27.07.2016. None appeared for the respondent.

As the reasons mentioned in the application for non-appearance of the counsel for the appellant are found to be satisfactory, the application is allowed and the main appeal is ordered to be restored to its original number.

On request of learned counsel for the appellant, the main appeal is taken up today itself for hearing.

FAO No.M-166 of 2013

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that as per settlement entered into between the parties, the appellant prefers to withdraw the main appeal itself.

Permission is granted.

Dismissed as withdrawn, as prayed for.

(M. JEYAPPAUL)
JUDGE

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

July 29, 2016
Dinesh Bansal

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