



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

118

RSA-554-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.09.2025

Dogar Singh @ Doger Singh

.... Appellant

Versus

Raj Kumar

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - None.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

1. The appellant-plaintiff is in second appeal against the judgment and decree dated 08.11.2023, passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Faridkot, vide which the appeal filed by the respondent-defendant was allowed reversing the judgment and decree dated 04.04.2022, passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Jaitu; and the suit for recovery filed by the appellant-plaintiff was dismissed.

2. The present appeal pertains to the year 2024 and notice is yet to be issued in the same. Perusal of the order-sheet(s) reveals that since the inception of present appeal, the same was listed for hearing for 04 times, out of which on 03 dates of hearing i.e. 28.02.2024, 28.05.2024 and 03.12.2024, the same was adjourned at the request of learned counsel for the appellant; whereas on the last date of hearing i.e. 24.02.2025, the appellant had gone un-represented and following order was passed by this Court:-

“The matter pertains to the year 2024 and notice is yet to be issued in the same.



On the last date of hearing i.e. 03.12.2024, learned counsel for the appellant had sought time to place on record the testimony of PW-1 as it was the positive argument of the appellant that the said testimony was misread by the First Appellate Court.

None has put in appearance on behalf of the appellant, despite the case having been called twice.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 19.09.2025.

Last opportunity is granted to do the needful.”

3. Office report indicates that no document has been filed by learned counsel for the appellant till date in compliance of order dated 03.12.2024, despite granting of last opportunity vide order dated 24.02.2025 reproduced above. Today, even in the second round of hearing, the appellant had gone un-represented.

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.

19.09.2025
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No