

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

CWP-19834-2014 (O&M)

Date of decision: 31.08.2023

Amit Goyal and another

....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- None for the petitioners.

Ms. Akshita Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Soni, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition is for quashing the impugned order dated 07.08.2009 passed by respondent No.3 passed by respondent No.3 enhancing the annual rental value five times and the impugned order dated 13.11.2013 passed by respondent No.3 against the directions contained in order dated 13.09.2010 passed by Divisional Commissioner, Patiala Division, Patiala i.e. respondent No.4 accepting the appeal of the petitioners being without jurisdiction and for quashing the impugned notice dated 27.06.2014 under Section 138 of the Punjab Municipal Corporation Act, 1976 for attachment and sale of property No.12408-A/5-II of the petitioners for realization of the House Tax Rs.10.20,576/- upto the year 2012-13 passed by respondent No.2.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 has submitted that this Court vide order dated 11.01.2016 observed that there was no

representation on behalf of the petitioners. The case was adjourned thereafter. However, the petitioners were still not represented. Perusal of the interim order would show that even on 21.01.2020, petitioners were not represented by anyone and thereafter, the case was adjourned on 12.05.2022. Again on the said date, no one was present. Thereafter case came up on hearing on 28.10.2022 and again no one was present on behalf of the petitioners. Same is the position as on date. It appears that the petitioners are not interested in pursuing their case.

002In view of the above, present petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

31.08.2023
m. sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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