

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-7986-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision : 21.04.2023

Jugraj Singh ... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Surjeet Singh ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : None.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

1. On 10.01.2023 the following order was passed :

“On 11.12.2019 the following order was passed :

“Learned counsel for revisionist-plaintiff contends that the trial court failed to appreciate that the entire suit property has been sold by respondent without any necessity, to a stranger namely Amarjit Kaur. Thus, said vendee was liable to be impleaded as a party to avoid multiplicity of litigation.

Notice of motion for 29.04.2020.

Meanwhile, further proceedings before the trial court shall remain stayed.

Respondent be served for the date fixed through ordinary process, registered post and dasti as well on furnishing requisite number of copies of the paper-book, registered cover, process fee and incidental expenses, if any, within two weeks.

In case of non-compliance of this order in its letter and spirit, this appeal shall positively be dismissed for want of prosecution.”

Due to non-furnishing of requisite process fee along with copies of the petition, notice could not be issued to the respondent. Thereafter, no efforts were made by counsel for the petitioner to try and get the service effected. Today, counsel for the petitioner states that arguing counsel is unwell and requests for some time to furnish process fee and the requisite copies of the revision petition.

In view of the order dated 11.12.2019, though there is no scope for further adjourning the matter, however, in the interest of justice, one last opportunity is granted to the petitioner to furnish the requisite copies of the revision petition as well as process fee within the next three working days subject to payment of costs of Rs.20,000/- to be deposited with the High Court Lawyers Welfare Fund.

On the needful being done, let fresh notice be issued to the respondent returnable 11.04.2023.”

2. None had put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner on 11.04.2023. As per the office report, there is no compliance of order dated 10.01.2023 till date. It appears that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the present revision petition. This Court is left with no other option but to dismiss the present revision petition for non-prosecution.

3. Dismissed for non-prosecution.

21.04.2023
Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO