

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.D.RAJAN

FRIDAY, THE 25TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/3RD ASWINA, 1937

Cr1.Rev.Pet.No. 2999 of 2007 ()

AGAINST THE ORDER IN CMP 424/2007 of CHIEF JUDL.MAGISTRATE, ERNAKULAM
DATED 11-04-2007

REVISION PETITIONER(S)/COMPLAINANT::

M/S. MUTHOOT LEASING AND FINANCE LTD.,
MUTHOOT CHAMBERS, BANERJI ROAD, ERNAKULAM
REP. BY ITS POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER
JAYAN THAKAPPAN.

BY ADV. SRI.SABU S.KALLARAMOOLA

RESPONDENT(S)/STATE & ACCUSED::

1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.
2. SAJU MOHAMMED,
PEZHUMKATTIL, NADACKAL P.O., ERATTUPETTA
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

R1, BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI. N. SURESH.

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 25-09-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

acd

P.D. RAJAN, J.

Crl.R.P.No.2999 of 2007

Dated this the 25th day of September, 2015

ORDER

This revision petition is preferred against the order in C.M.P.No.424/2007 dated 11.4.2007 on the file of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ernakulam. The revision petitioner filed the above petition to condone the delay of 23 days in filing the complaint, which was dismissed. Being aggrieved by that order, this revision petition is preferred.

2. After filing this revision petition, this Court directed the revision petitioner to take steps to issue notice to the 2nd respondent. In spite of several directions, no steps have been taken to give notice to the 2nd respondent. In the circumstances, I heard the revision petitioner. It is

true that on 11.4.2007, the case was posted for evidence of the defacto complainant. On that day, the complainant was absent in the trial Court and no application was filed. There was no representation from his side, hence C.M.P was dismissed. I do not find any illegality in the above order. Therefore, there is no merit in this revision petition and it is dismissed accordingly.

P.D. RAJAN, JUDGE.

acd

