

**\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of Reserve: 6<sup>th</sup> July, 2010

Date of Order: July 15, 2010

**Crl. M.C. No. 1596/2009, Crl. M.A. No. 5746/2009**

%

**15.07.2010**

**RAM AWADH PANDEY**

**... Petitioner**

Through: Mr. Sanjay Garg, Adv.

Versus

**PIYUSH**

**... Respondents**

Through: Nemo.

**JUSTICE SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA**

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporter or not?
3. Whether judgment should be reported in Digest?

**JUDGMENT**

1. By this petition under section 482 Cr.P.C., the petitioner has assailed order dated 14<sup>th</sup> July, 2008 passed by learned ASJ in a Revision Petition.
2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of deciding this petition are that the petitioner, an Advocate, filed complaint before the court of learned M.M. in his personal capacity as complainant. Learned M.M. dismissed the complaint finding that there was no substance in the complaint.

3. Against the order of learned M.M., the petitioner preferred a revision before learned ASJ. Learned ASJ, after going through the facts of the case, came to conclusion that the order of learned M.M. was as per law and there was no substance in the complaint.

4. The complaint was filed by the petitioner that a pro-note and cheque was got signed from him without making him payment of the pro-note amount. These allegations were found untenable by the two courts. By this petition, the petitioner has assailed concurrent finding of two courts below. The petitioner and the respondent both are Advocates and have filed case and counter case which were found to be false.

I find that there was no reason for this court to interfere with the order passed by learned ASJ. The petition is hereby dismissed being without merits.

**July 15, 2010**  
acm

**SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA, J.**