



2026:PHHC:062348-DB



2026:PHHC:072269-DB

**245 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Date of Decision : 23.04.2026

1. LPA-1952-2014 (O&M)

JAGTAR SINGH & ANRAppellants
V/S
STATE OF HARYANA & ORSRespondents

2. LPA-1953-2014 (O&M)

TRILOK SINGH AND ANRAppellants
V/S
STATE OF HARYANA AND ORSRespondents

3. LPA-1954-2014 (O&M)

CHANNO DEVIAppellant
V/S
STATE OF HARYANA AND ORSRespondents

4. LPA-1957-2014 (O&M)

JOGINDER SINGH AND ORSAppellants
V/S
STATE OF HARYANA AND ORSRespondents

5. LPA-1958-2014 (O&M)

TRILOK SINGH AND ORSAppellants
V/S
STATE OF HARYANA & ORSRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: None for the appellant(s).

Ms. Anu Pal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Verma, Advocate
for respondent Nos.7 to 10, 13 and 14.



HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. Present bunch of appeals, the details of which are mentioned in the heading, involve common question of law in the context of common set of facts and thus they are being decided by a common order.
2. Every time the case is taken up for hearing, there is a request for adjournment on behalf of learned counsel for the appellant in all the cases.
3. It has been noticed that for the last three years, the appeals are either adjourned on request or on written requests made on behalf of the learned counsel for the appellant(s).
4. Today again, the same modus operandi has been brought into operation on the ground that the learned counsel for the appellant(s) is out of station, which, as per the settled principle of law, is not a valid ground for an adjournment. Hence, it can be safely presumed that the appellant(s) is not interested in pursuing the present appeals.
5. Dismissed for non-prosecution.
6. Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

23-04-2026
Sapna Goyal

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/ reasoned: YES
Whether reportable: NO