

RSA No. 1682 of 1989
RSA No. 1965 of 1989
CWP No. 5676 of 2002

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

RSA No. 1682 of 1989
Date of decision: 7.3.2017

Central Bank of India

...Appellant

Versus

M/s Universal Auto and General Financers and others

...Respondents

RSA No. 1965 of 1989

Central Bank of India

...Appellant

Versus

The Oriental Fire and General Insurance Co. Limited and others

...Respondents

CWP No. 5676 of 2002

Avtar Singh Sahni

...Petitioner

Versus

Central Bank of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. A.K.Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP No. 5676 of 2002.

RSA No. 1682 of 1989
RSA No. 1965 of 1989
CWP No. 5676 of 2002

2

Ms. Ankita Sambyal, Advocate for
Mr. Nitin Sarin, Advocate
for respondent No.1 to 10 in RSA No. 1682 of 1989.

None for Central Bank of India.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

These two regular second appeals bearing RSA No. 1682 and 1965 of 1989 as well as CWP No. 5676 of 2002, are being decided vide this common order.

When these cases came up for hearing on 11.2.2015, following order was passed by this Court:-

Learned Proxy Counsel for the appellant prays for short adjournment due to non-availability of the arguing Counsel.

Mr. Sarin and Mr. Jain, Advocates for one of the partners of M/s Universal Auto and General Financiers, who filed the writ petition state that both the aforesaid appeals as well as the writ petition become infructuous in the light of an amicable settlement arrived at between the parties regarding their dispute whereby M/s Universal Auto and General Financiers has already paid the settled amount.

Adjourned to 25.02.2015.

It is directed that an authorised representative of the Bank be present in the Court on the next date of hearing.

Inspite of the abovesaid specific directions having been issued by this Court, neither anybody has come present on behalf of the appellant-Bank, nor any request for pass over has been made.

RSA No. 1682 of 1989
RSA No. 1965 of 1989
CWP No. 5676 of 2002

3

On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents as well as learned counsel for the petitioner in the writ petition jointly pray for disposing of these cases, as having been rendered infructuous, in view of the fact that parties have already arrived at an amicable settlement. They further submit that nobody seems to be interested in pursuing these appeals on behalf of the appellant as well as writ petition on behalf of the respondent. They have been found justified in saying so.

In view of the above, both these regular second appeals as well as the writ petition are ordered to be disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous.

7.3.2017
AK Sharma

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No