

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

125

CR-941-2017

Date of Decision:11.07.2017

Jai Bhagwan

.....Petitioner

Versus

Neelam

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK.

Present: None.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J.(Oral)

When the case came up for hearing on 09.02.2017, following order was passed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to file a specific affidavit of the petitioner, whether he is regularly paying the amount of maintenance of ₹4,200/- per month to his wife and daughters and whether he has paid the litigation expenses. He shall also specify in the affidavit that he is not in arrears of maintenance in compliance of the order dated 3.5.2016 (Annexure P-5), passed by Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Safidon, so that validity of the impugned order passed by learned family court under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, can be considered.

List on 8.3.2017.”

On 08.03.2017, learned counsel for the petitioner sought and was granted more time adjourning the case to 17.05.2017. When the previous order was not complied with by the petitioner upto 17.05.2017, following order was passed by this Court on 17.05.2017:-

“As per office report dated 15.5.2017, order dated 9.2.2017 passed by this Court has not been complied with by the petitioner so far. Vide order dated 8.3.2017, petitioner was granted one more opportunity to comply with the abovesaid

order dated 9.2.2017, adjourning the case for today. However, today neither anybody has come present on behalf of the petitioner nor any request for pass over has been made.

In the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to the petitioner to ensure meticulous compliance of the order dated 9.2.2017 before the next date of hearing, failing which, present revision petition would stand dismissed for non compliance of orders dated 9.2.2017.

List on 25.5.2017.”

Thereafter, when the case came up for hearing on 25.05.2017, none appeared and the case was adjourned for today by passing the following order:-

“Called twice.

Neither anybody has come present to press this revision petition nor any request for pass over has been made on behalf of the petitioner.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 11.7.2017.”

Similar is the position today. Neither the abovesaid order has been complied with by the petitioner, nor anybody has come present to press the present revision petition. It seems that neither the petitioner nor his counsel are interested in pursuing the present revision petition any further.

In this view of the matter, this Court is left with no other option except to dismiss the revision petition for want of prosecution.

Accordingly, the present revision petition is dismissed for want of prosecution.

July 11, 2017
seema

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No