

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

RSA No. 46 of 2020

Date of Decision: 13.03.2020

Ram Kali

.....Appellant

Vs.

Saurabh Garg

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Ms. Swaranjeet Kaur, Advocate, for  
Mr. Vijay Pal, Advocate,  
for the appellant.

\*\*\*\*\*

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

On 17.02.2020, repeating the order dated 29.01.2020, the following  
order had been passed:-

*“On 29.01.2020, the following order had been passed:-*

*“Learned counsel for the appellant  
submits that as regards the finding of the trial  
court to the extent that there was no relationship  
proved between the respondent-plaintiff and the  
firm of commission agents with whom the  
appellants' husband had dealings, in fact it was  
proved on record that one of the shops from  
which the said commission agents is operating  
belongs to the father of the respondent-plaintiff.  
He would place on record the order of the trial  
court showing that the second plaintiff, i.e. Om  
Parkash, as had stood witness, withdrew from the  
suit or not.*

*Adjourned to 17.02.2020.”*

*No order of the trial court as has been referred*

*to above, has been placed on record. Today a request for an adjournment has been made on behalf of learned counsel for the appellant.*

*Adjourned to 13.03.2020, with the order dated 29.01.2020 repeated and it made clear that if it is not complied with even by the next date of hearing, the appeal would stand dismissed in default.”*

Today, learned counsel appearing for the appellant seeks more time to comply with the order dated 29.01.2020.

Dismissed-in-default, in terms of the order dated 17.02.2020.

**March 13, 2020**

nitin/dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)**

**JUDGE**

Yes

No.