

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

(203)

RSA-3602-1997 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-12.09.2025

ROSHAN LAL

... Appellant

Versus

MOHD. ISMAIL & OTHERS

... Respondents


CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- None for the appellant.

Mr. Arun Jindal, Advocate and
Mr. Mayank Bansal, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. As per the office report, the notice issued to the sole appellant has been received back unserved with the endorsement that a detailed and complete address is required for effecting service upon him. Despite sufficient opportunity, none has chosen to appear on behalf of the appellant, and even the correct particulars of address have not been furnished to facilitate effective service. In such circumstances, this Court finds itself constrained, there being no alternative, but to dismiss the present appeal for want of prosecution and it seems as well that appellant himself does not want to pursue this appeal.
2. In view of the foregoing and taking into account the prevailing circumstances, this Court finds no justification to keep the present appeal



pending on the docket indefinitely without any effective prosecution. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution. However, liberty is reserved to the appellant to seek revival of the appeal, if so aggrieved by this order, by filing an appropriate application within a period of **three months** from today, subject to showing sufficient cause.

3. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands also disposed of.

12.09.2025
Gaurav Sorot

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

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