

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

RSA-2484-1992 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 03.10.2023

PARGAT SINGH

....Appellant.

Vs.

MALOOK SINGH AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM:-HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- None.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

Notice was ordered to be issued to the appellant as well as respondent as nobody was appearing in the instant case. Initially the appeal was filed by Pargat Singh. After his death, his legal heirs were impleaded and the other appellants were Sukhdev Singh and Balraj Singh. Notice was ordered to be issued in the ordinary process as well as by way of affixation. As per the report received, the appellant Nos.1 (a) and 1 (d) have expired. The appellant No.1 (c) refused to receive the notice. The affixation was done in the presence of Sarpanch of the village. Notice of appellant No.1 (b) and 1 (e) received back unserved with the report that their guardian had expired. Perusal of memo of parties shows that the appellant No.1 (b) and 1 (e) were minors at the time of filing of appeal in the year 1992. At present they have already attained the age of majority. Despite notice, even by affixation, nobody has turned up to pursue the Regular Second Appeal.

Notice of respondent Nos.1, 3 and 4 also received back with the report that they have expired. Affixation was done in the presence of Sarpanch of village. Notice of respondent No.2 was received back with the report that he was not residing at the given address. However, at the given address, affixation was done.

In the case in hand, nobody is appearing on behalf of the appellants and respondents. Considering the aforesaid factual position, the Regular Second Appeal stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

03.10.2023

snd

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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