



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

232

RSA-2267-2001 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.08.2025

Punjab National Bank

.... Appellant

Versus

M/s Roopam Collections and others

.... Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Munish Thakur, Advocate for the appellant  
(through Video Conferencing).

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

1. Appellant/plaintiff-Bank is in second appeal against the judgment and decree dated 03.06.2000, passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Panchkula, whereby the appeal filed by the plaintiff-Bank against the judgment and decree dated 10.11.1999, passed by the learned Trial Court was partly allowed; and judgment and decree of the learned trial Court was modified to the extent that the plaintiff-Bank would be held entitled to interest @ 20.75% per annum with quarterly rests from the date of institution of the suit till the date of decree to be calculated on the decretal amount.

2. The matter pertains to the year 2001 and on the last date of hearing 28.03.2025, when this case was listed for hearing, following order was passed by this Court:-

*“Mr. Munish Thakur, Advocate has put in appearance and filed Memorandum of Appearance on behalf of appellant. The same is taken on record. He undertakes to file Power of Attorney on behalf of appellant within two weeks in the Registry.*

*The appeal pertains to the year 2001.*

*As per office report notice issued to respondent No.1 has been received back unserved with the report firm*



*closed'; and notice issued to respondents No.2 to 4 have been received back unserved with the report 'not residing at the given address'.*

*Learned counsel for the appellant undertakes to furnish latest, correct and complete address of the respondents in the Registry within two weeks from today.*

*On his doing so, fresh notice to respondents be issued for 19.8.2025."*

3. Office report dated 13.08.2025, indicates that fresh notices to respondents No. 1 to 4 could not be issued as, learned counsel for the appellant had not furnished their correct address, till date.

4. Today, learned counsel appearing for the appellant-Bank submits that despite repeated requests, he is receiving no fresh instructions from the appellant-Bank.

5. In view of the above, the instant regular second appeal is accordingly, **disposed of**, with liberty to the appellant-Bank, to move an appropriate application within a period of 02 months from today for reviving the same, if any cause of action survives, however, subject to payment of ₹25,000/- as costs to be deposited by the appellant-Bank prior to filing application for revival.

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

19.08.2025  
*rishu*

( NIDHI GUPTA )  
JUDGE

**Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No**

**Whether Reportable Yes/No**