

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

(102)

RSA-3105-1994 (O&M)Date of Decision:-**17.09.2025**

MALKIAT SINGH

... Appellant

Versus

NACHHATTAR SINGH AND OTHERS

... Respondents


CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- None for the appellant.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. Despite the matter having been called twice, none has chosen to appear on behalf of the appellant. This is an old appeal and has remained pending for a considerable length of time, and the record further reflects that on the last '***three consecutive dates***' as well, there was no representation on behalf of the appellant. Such persistent non-appearance unmistakably points to a lack of due diligence and conveys that the appellant is not interested in pursuing the present proceedings.

2. In these circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the appeal to remain pending on the docket indefinitely. Courts' time is a valuable resource and cannot be permitted to be wasted at the instance of a litigant who has exhibited complete indifference towards the prosecution of the case. Consequently, the appeal stands dismissed for want of prosecution. Nonetheless, in order to safeguard the ends of justice, liberty is reserved to the appellant to seek revival of the appeal, if so advised, by



filing an appropriate application within a period of three months from today, subject to showing sufficient cause for earlier default.

3. As the main matter already stands adjudicated, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, alive. Accordingly, all such application(s) shall be deemed to have been rendered infructuous and are hereby disposed of in the same terms.

17.09.2025
Gaurav Sorot

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No