



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

202

CWP No.2354 of 2012

DATE OF DECISION : 17th MARCH, 2025

Harnam Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & another

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

* * * *

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Dharam Chand Mittal, Sr. Panel Counsel
for respondent No.1-UOI.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

* * * *

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. This petition was ordered to be adjourned *sine die* vide order dated 20.07.2018, and thereafter, the matter has been ordered to be listed before this court in motion hearing on dated 13.01.2025. This court vide order dated 13.01.2025 passed the following order :

“The instant petition was adjourned sine die vide order dated 20.7.2018 and after that the matter has been listed before this Court.

Today, no one has caused appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 17.3.2025.

The Registry is directed to inform the learned counsel for the petitioner about the next date of hearing.



It goes without saying that in case there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner on the next date of hearing, this Court would construe that the petitioner is no more interested in pursuing the instant petition.”

2. As per office report the counsel for the petitioner has been informed telephonically by the Registry of this court. However, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner today as well. It is already 3:30 pm. It seems that the petitioner is not interested to pursue the instant matter.

3. Therefore, this Court is left with no other option, except to dismiss the instant petition for want of prosecution.

4. Ordered accordingly.

5. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner, to revive the instant petition by filing an apt motion, in case the grievance still survives.

17TH March, 2025
'raj'

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>