



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

108

FAO-2026-1994 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-08.04.2026

Mulakh RajAppellant
Versus
Balbir Singh and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Raghav Gulati, Advocate, for
Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Vinod Chaudhri, Advocate, &
Mr. Jayant Singh Chauhan, Advocate,
for the respondent No.3/Insurance Company.

AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits that he has no instruction in the matter as his client is not in contact with him. He further submits that he could not get the correct/complete address of respondent No.2 in compliance of the order dated 19.02.2026.
2. In view of the above, and considering the fact that the present appeal pertains to the year 1994, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the matter pending. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed for non-prosecution, with liberty to the appellant to seek revival of the same, if so advised, as per law.
3. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

08.04.2026
anil

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

