

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

RSA-1952-2003

Date of Decision:03.10.2018

Raj Dulari and others

.....Appellants

Vs.

Phullo and another

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: None for appellant no.1.

Mr.Varun Mittal, Advocate for
Mr.Vikas Mohan Gupta, Advocate,
for the appellant no.3
(Guardian appointed by the Court vide
order dated 21.04.2016)

Respondent no.2 proceeded against *ex parte*
vide order dated 12.03.2014.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Pursuant to the order of this Court dated December 12, 2017, a report from the learned Civil Judge (Sr.Divn.), Kaithal, dated 28.02.2018, has been received, a copy of which is on record, wherein it is stated that upon notice been issued to her, i.e. the appellant herein (Raj Dulari), she had appeared in Court and had suffered a statement that in compliance of the order of this Court dated 24.08.2011 (passed in RSA-1338-1986 as noticed in the aforesaid order of this Court dated December 12, 2017), a sale deed had been executed in favour of her son and herself as also her daughter Manju.

Learned counsel for the appellant no.3 submits that that being so, this appeal would be rendered infructuous, the suit property being the same as was the subject matter of RSA no.1338 of 1986.

Consequently, this appeal is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

October 03, 2018.
dharamvir

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES/NO
Whether Reportable : YES/NO