



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

228

RSA-1995-2001 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.09.2025

M/s Siddartha Woolen Mills

.... Appellant

Versus

M/s Wilhelm Daghofer and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Rajinder Goel, Advocate for the appellant.

Ms. Rahish Pahwa, Advocate
for respondents No. 3 and 4-Bank
(through Video Conferencing).

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

1. The appellant-plaintiff is in second appeal against the judgment and decree dated 21.12.2000, passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Panipat, vide which the appeal filed by defendants No. 2 and 3/respondents No. 3 and 4 herein was allowed reversing the judgment and decree dated 26.09.1996, passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Panipat.

2. The present appeal pertains to the year 2001 and on the last date of hearing i.e. 25.03.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“The matter pertains to the year 2001 and was lastly, listed for hearing before the Daily Lok Adalat on 01.05.2025.

As per office report, learned counsel for the parties have been duly informed about the date fixed. However, none has put in appearance on behalf of either of the parties.

In view of the above and in the interest of justice, let actual date of hearing notices be issued to the appellant as well as the respondents for 10.09.2025. Registry shall also make an effort to effect service upon both the parties through the SHO of the concerned area, so that effective steps can be taken to dispose of the matter.”



3. Pursuant thereto, office report dated 09.09.2025 has been received which reads as follows:-

Sole Appellant	Served.
Respondents No. 1 and 2	Notices could not be issued as no foreign AD cover has filed.
Respondent No.3	Served through Branch Manager
Respondent No. 4	Notice not received back either served or otherwise from Delhi.

4. Today, Mr. Rajinder Goel, learned counsel appearing for the appellant has pleaded 'no instructions' in the matter.

5. Learned counsel appearing (through Video Conferencing) on behalf respondents No. 3 and 4-Bank submits that the matter has been assigned to her yesterday only and, therefore, she seeks time to prepare the case and make submissions.

6. Heard.

7. In view of the fact that the appellant stands duly served, however, no fresh instructions have been received by learned counsel for the appellant in the matter. Therefore, it is clear that the appellant is no longer interested in pursuing the present appeal which is pending adjudication before this Court for the last more than 24 years. Thus, this Court is left with no other option except to **dismiss** the same for non-prosecution.

8. Ordered accordingly.

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

10.09.2025
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No