

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

CWP-8712-2002

Date of Decision: 09.10.2023

Ajaib Singh Fireman (Retd.)

..... Petitioner

Versus

Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Suraj Mandhan, Advocate for
Mr. Suman Jain, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner (Ajaib Singh) has filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for setting aside impugned order dated 20.12.2001, whereby a sum of Rs.46,212/- as arrears of license fee/penal rent in respect of the allotted government accommodation was ordered to be recovered from the petitioner. A further prayer has been made to set aside impugned order dated 02.05.2002, whereby the petitioner's application for waiver of arrears of license fee in respect of the aforesaid government accommodation was rejected.

2. A perusal of file reveals that on 08.11.2013, learned counsel for the petitioner had sought an accommodation to move an application to amend the writ petition and the matter was adjourned *sine die* by this Court

with a stipulation that the same would be listed as and when the aforesaid application is filed by learned counsel for the petitioner. However, it seems that no action was taken by learned counsel for the petitioner and subsequent thereto, the instant matter was listed for hearing on 18.04.2023, when the following order was passed by this Court:-

“The present petition is of the year 2002 and it was adjourned sine die on 08.11.2013 and thereafter the same has been listed today.

Mr. Paras Choudhary, Advocate has appeared on behalf of Mr. Suman Jain, Advocate for the respondents but nobody has caused appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

The Registry is directed to inform the learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to the next date of hearing fixed by this Court by way of written communication.

Adjourned to 09.10.2023.”

3. As per office report, Mr. Daman Dhir, Advocate has been informed through e-mail and the letter issued to him has also been received back served; and Mr. P.S. Bajwa, Advocate has been informed telephonically as well as through S.M.S. However even today, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It appears that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant matter any further.

4. In view of the above, the present petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

5. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

09.10.2023

Apurva

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

2. Whether reportable : Yes/No