

343

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RSA-214-1991 (O&M)

Date of decision : 20.03.2018

Ram Kishan

... Appellant(s)

Versus

Harkesh and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. B.R. Rana, Advocate
for the appellant(s).

Mr. Sanjay Pathania, Advocate
for the respondents.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that he has no instructions from his client whether he is interested in pursuing the matter or not, for, the appellant is none-else, but the plaintiff in the suit bearing No.937 of 1985 titled as “Gathar and others V/s Chandan and others” seeking permanent injunction and in the alternative for possession and mandatory injunction as a consequential relief, which though decreed by the trial Court vide judgment and decree dated 01.12.1988 has been dismissed by the lower Appellate Court vide judgment and decree dated 29.08.1990.

The appeal is of the year 1991. It appears that the appellant is not interested in pursuing the matter, much less, he must have adapted to the hard ground reality.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

20.03.2018

Yogesh Sharma

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/ No

Whether Reportable

Yes/ No