



220 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: September 15, 2025

(i) RSA No.2619 of 2008 (O&M)

Baldev Singh and another ... Appellants

Versus

Surjit Kaur ...Respondent

*** * * ***

(ii) COCP No.1940 of 2021

Surjit Kaur ... Petitioner

Versus

Baldev Singh and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- None for the appellants in RSA No.2619 of 2008 and for the respondents in COCP No.1940 of 2021.

Mr. N.K. Vadehra, Advocate
for the respondent in RSA No.2619 of 2008 and
for the petitioner in COCP No.1940 of 2008.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(Oral)

There is no representation on behalf of the appellants in RSA No.2619 of 2008 and for the respondent in COCP No.1940 of 2021.

2. In fact, appearance on behalf of appellants – Baldev Singh and another was made last time through Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate on 29.03.2022.

3. On 10.01.2023, following order was passed by this Court:-

“Since there is no representation on behalf of the appellant(s), purely in the interest of justice, posted for 07.08.2023. It is made clear that in case matter is not argued on the next date of hearing, this Court would be constrained to vacate the interim stay granted on 05.08.2009.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file(s) of the connected matter(s).”

4. Despite the aforesaid order and intimation to learned counsel for the appellants, nobody has put in appearance on behalf of the appellants in RSA No.2619 of 2008 and for the respondents in COCP No.1940 of 2021 till date.

5. Today again there is no representation on behalf of appellants – Baldev Singh and another. On the last date of hearing also, nobody had put in appearance for the said appellants. It appears that the appellants are no longer interested in pursuing the appeal, i.e. RSA No.2619 of 2008.

6. As such, RSA No.2619 of 2008 is hereby dismissed in default for want of prosecution.

All the pending application(s), if any also stand(s) disposed of.

COCP No.1940 of 2021

Vide order dated 05.08.2009 passed in RSA No.2619 of 2008, this Court had directed the parties to maintain status quo regarding the possession over the property in dispute till further orders. The present petition was thereafter filed by the plaintiff-respondent in RSA alleging that, despite the said direction, the appellants in RSA had tried to lay foundation by digging over the property in dispute, thereby committing civil contempt within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. However, learned counsel for the plaintiff-respondent-petitioner did not press the aforesaid COCP.

Accordingly, the same stands disposed of being not pressed.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the connected case file.

September 15, 2025

sarita

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No