



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

**213**

**RSA-4160-2011 (O&M)**

Date of Decision: 21.04.2026

Gram Panchayat Village Wattu Bhatti

.... Appellant

Versus

Gurcharan Singh and others

.... Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Yogesh Kumar Aneja, Advocate for  
Mr. GL Bajaj, Advocate for the appellant.

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

1. The appellant-defendant/Gram Panchayat is in second appeal against the judgment of reversal dated 27.01.2011 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Ferozepur whereby the appeal filed by the respondent/plaintiffs was allowed setting aside the judgment and decree dated 06.09.2005 passed by the learned trial Court; and the suit for declaration filed by the plaintiffs was decreed.

2. The matter pertains to the year 2011 and notice of motion was issued by the Predecessor Bench way back vide order dated 26.11.2012. Thereafter, the present appeal has been listed for hearing 15 times, out of which on 08 dates of hearing (including last 05 consecutive dates of hearing) i.e. 18.11.2013, 25.08.2015, 29.09.2016, 22.11.2018, 06.12.2018, 27.02.2019, 06.12.2019 and 26.05.2025, the matter was adjourned either at the written or oral request of learned counsel for the appellant.



3. Today again for the 06<sup>th</sup> repeated date of hearing, learned proxy counsel for the appellant prays for an adjournment on the ground that learned arguing counsel is not available.

4. A bare reading of the above facts shows that the appellant-Gram Panchayat exhibited an utterly casual attitude in its pursuit of the present litigation. It is not for this Court to be chasing recalcitrant parties or their counsel to argue the matter before the Court; especially of such old vintage as the present one. It is to be appreciated that valuable public time of the Court cannot be whiled away in affording innumerable opportunities to lackadaisical litigants 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 the respondents, or learned counsel for the parties are 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.

**21.04.2026**  
*rishu*

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

**Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No**

**Whether Reportable Yes/No**