

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

**LPA No.1912 of 2017 (O&M) in
CWP No.3075 of 2012
Date of Decision: 02.05.2018**

Satnam Singh Bagichi

..... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. S. WALIA**

Present: None for the appellant.

RAJESH BINDAL J.

The case was earlier listed twice but none appeared on behalf of the appellant. There is a delay of 66 days in filing and 36 days in re-filing the appeal. Today again adjournment slip has been filed.

When the case was taken up in the first call, none appeared to represent the appellant and the case was passed over. Even on the second call, none appeared on behalf of the appellant.

Keeping in view the past record, we do not find any reason to adjourn the case.

The appellant had filed the writ petition praying for the action against respondent No.3 in the writ petition. The issue has been considered by the learned Single Judge. The appellant has not been able to establish his locus. The writ petition was not found to have been filed in public interest. The same was dismissed.

There is no error in the order passed by the learned Single Judge. However, as none appeared for the appellant, the appeal is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(RAJESH BINDAL)
JUDGE

(B. S. WALIA)
JUDGE

02.05.2018
rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No