

226

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

**RSA-6196-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : 27.07.2016**

Satnam Singh

... Appellant

Versus

Lok Raj

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. A.K. Khunger, 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?

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

Mr. A.K. Khunger, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant-defendant submits that the suit has been filed for recovery of ₹ 40,3000/- and during the pendency of the appeal in this Court, the parties have arrived at compromise. He has already paid the entire amount, thus, no cause of action survives in the present appeal, but prays for refund of the Court fee amounting to ₹ 14,860/-

Despite the issuance of the notice, the respondent-plaintiff has not put in appearance.

In view of the fact that the appellant has died and the matter has been compromised, I deem it appropriate to order refund of the court fee and

accordingly, the appellant-defendant shall be entitled for the refund of the Court fee amounting to ₹ 14,860/- in accordance with law.

In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances of the case, no cause of action survives in the present appeal and accordingly, the appeal is ordered to be dismissed as infructuous.

27.07.2016
yogesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

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