

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.D.RAJAN

FRIDAY, THE 31ST DAY OF JULY 2015/9TH SRAVANA, 1937

Cr1.Rev.Pet.No. 4630 of 2006 ()

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN CRA 223/2005 of SESSIONS COURT, THRISSUR
DATED 22-08-2006

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN CC 984/2003 of J.M.F.C., KODUNGALLUR
DATED 26-02-2005

PETITIONER(S) /APPELLANT/ACCUSED:

JOSE, AGED YEARS, S/O. PAILI,
PARAMBI HOUSE, VELLANGALLUR, VADAKKUMKARA.

BY ADVS.SRI.K.P.MAJEED
SMT.M.ISHA
SRI.P.ANOOP (MULAVANA)

RESPONDENT(S) /COMPLAINANTS:

1. SUBRAMANIAN, S/O. KORUNNY,
KOZHIPARAMBIL HOUSE, ANAPUZHA, METHALA
KODUNGALLUR.
2. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF KERALA
ERNAKULAM.

BY ADV. SMT. SEENA RAMAKRISHNAN - PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 31-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

acd

P.D. RAJAN, J.

Crl.R.P.No. 4630 of 2006

Dated this the 31st day of July, 2015

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Petition is preferred against the judgment in Crl.Appeal No.223/2005 of Sessions Court, Thrissur, confirming the conviction passed by the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court-I, Kodungallur in C.C.No.984/2003. The criminal revision petitioner was the accused in the above C.C. He was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment till rising of the Court and to pay compensation of ₹75,000/- with 12% interest from 30.6.2003 till the date of realisation, in default, simple imprisonment for six months. Against that, he approached this Court with this revision petition.

2. On 10.4.2007, after admitting the case, this Court ordered notice to R1. In spite of that specific direction, no steps were taken against the 1st respondent. On 17.11.2014, there was no representation for the revision petitioner. However, this Court granted a week's time and directed that if the petitioner takes steps within a week, the office shall issue notice to the 1st respondent by speed post, otherwise, the revision petition will stand dismissed for non-prosecution.

3. Today, when the matter came up for hearing, I have perused the case record, which shows that no steps were taken by the revision petitioner, even after specific direction by this Court on 17.11.2014.

In such circumstances, this revision petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

P.D. RAJAN, JUDGE.