



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

217

RSA-690-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 09.09.2025

Shri Vijay Goel

.... Appellant

Versus

Mrs. Meenakshi Singla and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - None.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

1. Appellant-plaintiff is in second appeal against the concurrent findings rendered by both the Courts below whereby the suit for recovery filed by the plaintiff was dismissed by both the Courts below.

2. The present appeal pertains to the year 2017 and notice of motion in the same was issued by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 07.03.2018. Thereafter, the appeal was listed for hearing 05 times i.e. 01.03.2019, 06.08.2019, 07.11.2019, 27.11.2019 and 11.12.2019, out of which on 04 consecutive dates (06.08.2019, 07.11.2019, 27.11.2019 and 11.12.2019), the same was adjourned on account of non-appearance on behalf of the appellant. On 21.01.2020, when this case was listed for hearing, following order was passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court:-

“With the respondents having been proceeded against ex parte, vide an order passed on 01.03.2019 (notice of motion having been issued in the appeal on 07.03.2018), thereafter none has appeared even for the appellant for four dates running, with a request for an adjournment being made today.

Adjourned for the last time to 14.05.2020, with it made clear that if the appeal is not argued on that date also, it



would stand dismissed-in-default, with no further order required to be passed in that regard.”

3. On the next date of hearing i.e. 23.08.2022, learned counsel for the appellant had sought time to address arguments. Today again, none has put in appearance on behalf of the appellant, despite the case having been called twice.

4. A bare reading of the above facts shows that the appellant has exhibited an utterly casual attitude in his 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 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 appellant nor his 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.

5. Ordered accordingly.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

09.09.2025
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No