



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

248

RSA-3182-2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 17.02.2025

Gurdeep Kaur

.... Appellant

Versus

Amrinder Singh

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - None.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The present regular second appeal has been preferred by the appellant/judgment-debtor against the concurrent judgments and decrees of both the Courts below whereby the application for passing final decree in Civil Suit No. 102 of 2009 decided on 07.05.2012, filed by the respondent/decree-holder was allowed.

The matter pertains to the year 2018 and has come up for hearing after the year 2020.

Perusal of the order-sheet(s) shows that notice of the application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act (CM-8334-C-2018), was issued by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 24.05.2018. Thereafter the appeal has been listed for hearing 03 times, i.e. on 23.01.2019, 30.07.2019 and 30.01.2020, out of which on 02 dates i.e. on 23.01.2019 and 30.07.2019, the applicant-appellant had gone un-represented. The case is still at the stage of effecting service upon the respondent. As per office report, notice to the respondent could not be issued for want of process-fee and correct address etc. On the last date of



hearing i.e. 30.01.2020, last opportunity was granted to learned counsel for the applicant-appellant to do the needful, however, as per office report dated 14.02.2025 the needful has not been done by learned counsel for the applicant-appellant, so far. Today, there is no representation on behalf of the applicant-appellant, despite the case having been called twice.

A bare reading of the above facts shows that the applicant-appellant has exhibited an utterly casual attitude in her pursuit of the present litigation. It is to be appreciated that very valuable public time of the Court has been expended in affording opportunities to the applicant-applicant-appellant in the interest of justice. On the other hand, the appellant has adopted an utterly casual and careless approach. It is clear that neither the applicants-appellant nor her counsel is seriously interested in pursuing the present matter. Thus, this Court is left with no other option except to **dismiss** the same for non-prosecution.

Ordered accordingly.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stands disposed of.

17.02.2025
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No