



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

231

RSA-4849-2001 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.09.2025

Bhavnesk Kumar Sapra and another

.... Appellants

Versus

Ram Chand and others

.... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA**

Present: - None.

**NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)**

1. The appellant-defendants are in second appeal against the concurrent findings rendered by both the Courts below whereby the suit for permanent injunction filed by plaintiff/respondent No. 1 herein was decreed by both the Courts below.

2. The matter pertains to the year 2001 and on the last date of hearing 21.03.2025, when this case was listed for hearing, following order was passed by this Court:-

*“As per office report, learned counsel for respondent No. 1 as well as respondents No. 2 to 4 have been informed through e-mail. It is reported that learned counsel for the appellant has been elevated to this Bench, therefore, notices were issued to the appellants, which have been received back served, however, there is no representation on behalf of any of the parties.*

*Since the appeal is of the year 2001, in the interest of justice, fresh notices to the appellant as well as respondents and learned counsel for the respondents be issued for 10.09.2025.”*



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

Appellants No. 1 and 2	Not residing at the given address.
Respondents No. 1 and 3	Refusal and Affixation made.
Respondents No. 2 and 4	Died.

4. Office report dated 09.09.2025, further indicates that letter issued to Ms. Monica Goyal, Advocate has been received back with the report that 'she has been appointed as Judge in lower Court'. It is also reported that Mr. Jaswinder Singh, learned counsel for the respondent has been informed about the date fixed vide letter dated 26.05.2025. However, none has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent(s).

5. In view of the aforesaid premise, issuance of fresh notice to the appellants would be a futile exercise. It appears that due to sheer long pendency of the present second appeal before this Court for a period of more than 24 years, the appellants have lost interest in pursuing the same, as no attempt has been made by them to contact their counsel or to engage a new counsel.

6. Be that as it may, the instant regular second appeal is **disposed of**, with liberty to the appellants, to move an appropriate application within a period of 06 weeks from today for reviving the same, if so, advised.

7. 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