

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

**CR No.7355 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : May 16, 2018**

Gram Panchayat Rajthal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Maman Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Zorawar Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Jitender K. Sehrawat, advocate for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 23.05.2017 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Addl. District Judge, Hisar, vide which an application for restoration of the appeal was dismissed.

Heard.

It comes out that defendant No.3-petitioner had filed an appeal in the Court of learned Addl. District Judge, Hisar against the judgment and decree dated 16.01.1998. On 24.08.2000, none had appeared for the appellant and the counsel for the appellant also did not appear. Consequently, the appeal was dismissed in default. Now, after 15 years i.e. on 29.05.2015, the present petitioner instituted an application for restoration of the appeal, stating that the counsel did not inform about the dismissal of the appeal.

I fully agree with the view taken by the learned Addl. District Judge, Hisar that the plea that counsel did not inform the petitioner cannot be accepted. The petitioner-appellant is supposed to contact its counsel to

know about the progress of the case. Moreover in this computer age, the petitioner-appellant should have kept a track of the case. After 15 years, merely on the bald allegation that the counsel did not inform about the dismissal of appeal, the appeal cannot be restored.

As such, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

May 16, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No