



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

249

CR-4120-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 28.04.2025

Pawan Chaudhary

.... Petitioner

Versus

Arvinder Kaur and others

.... Respondents

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

Present: - None for petitioner.

Mr. Devansh Khanna, Advocate for

Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate for respondent No. 1.

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

Prayer in the instant revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, is for setting aside the impugned order dated 14.07.2022 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Amritsar whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Order I Rule 10 CPC for impleading the petitioner as defendant No. 5 was dismissed.

Perusal of the order-sheet(s) shows that the matter pertains to the year 2022 and notice of motion was issued on 07.12.2022. On the last date of hearing i.e. 19.07.2024 the petitioner had gone un-represented and following order was passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court:-

*“Memo of appearance is filed on behalf of respondent No. 1 today in Court and the same is taken on record.*

*Notice to respondent Nos. 2 to 5 have not been issued for want of correct address as the same has not been furnished by the petitioner as was directed by this Court vide order dated 23.02.2023 as reported by the Registry. Today, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.*

*In the interest of justice, adjourned to 09.01.2025 making it clear that no further opportunity shall be provided.*



*Petitioner has to comply with the order dated 23.02.2023 within 15 days. In case failure to do so, the Court will proceed further in accordance with law.*

Today again, the petitioner had gone un-represented, despite the case having been called twice; and even, as per office report, the order dated 23.02.2023, has not been complied by learned counsel for the petitioner, so far.

A bare reading of the above facts shows that the petitioner 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 petitioner in the interest of justice. On the other hand, the petitioner has adopted an utterly casual and careless approach. It is clear that neither the petitioner 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.

Ordered accordingly.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stands disposed of.

28.04.2025  
*rishu*

( **NIDHI GUPTA** )  
**JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned**    **Yes/No**

**Whether Reportable**            **Yes/No**