

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

230

CRR-394-2019

Date of decision: 12.09.2022

GURDEV SINGH

.... Petitioner

Versus

GAYATRI DEVI

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : None for the petitioner.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (oral)

On 21.02.2019, following order was passed:-

“This is a petition filed against the rejection of an application for additional evidence filed by the petitioner before the Appellate Court. On the previous occasion, I put it to the learned counsel that in case the amendment is allowed it would mean that the case has to be remanded for a fresh decision and the respondent would be prejudiced by this fact. He has stated that he would be willing to pay costs to the respondent.

Notice of motion.

Let the respondent be served dasti through his counsel in the Appellate Court. The summons would be issued only if the petitioner annexes a draft of Rs.45,000/- in favour of the complainant (to cover his legal expenses).

Adjourned to 11.03.2019.”

As per the officer report, no body turned to collect the *dasti* notice in compliance of the order dated 21.02.2019. Similarly, the amount as directed was never deposited.

In view of the fact that the petitioner has failed to comply with the order dated 21.02.2019, the present petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

**(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE**

September 12, 2022

Jyoti-IV

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