



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

**CR No.3867 of 2003
Date of Decision: 17.05.2024**

Satya Devi

...Revisionist-Petitioner

Versus

M/s Janindra Engineering Works and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- None for the revisionist-petitioner.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (Oral)

A perusal of the file reveals that vide the order dated 04.05.2004, the instant revision-petition had been adjourned *sine-die* with liberty to revive the same after the decision was rendered in **RSA No.1567 of 1980**. The afore-referred RSA had, ultimately, been decided on 04.03.2010. Thereafter, the petitioner had approached the Apex Court, by way of filing **SLP(C) No.29256 of 2010** and vide the order as passed on 26.05.2011, the present revision-petition had, again, been adjourned *sine-die* to await the decision of the above-said SLP and finally, the same had also been decided on 27.11.2015.

Since no application had been moved by the petitioner for seeking the revival of this revision-petition, therefore, the Registry had listed the same on 01.12.2023 and on that day, the petitioner remained unrepresented and hence, the notice was ordered to be issued to her for



15.12.2023. However, as reported by the Registry, the notice issued to the petitioner had been received back unserved with the report that there was no such village, as mentioned in her given address, in District Hoshiarpur. Then, the notice was, again, ordered to be issued to the petitioner and the same has been received back unserved with the report regarding her given address being incomplete.

In view of the afore-discussed facts and circumstances, this Court is left with no other option but to dismiss the revision-petition in hand for want of prosecution. Resultantly, the same stands dismissed accordingly.

17.05.2024
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*
Whether Reportable: *No*