

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 162 OF 2014

Mr. Sudarshan Singhal. ... Petitioner.
Versus
Ronash Consultants Developers and
Traders Pvt.Ltd. & ors. ... Respondents.

WITH
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 163 OF 2014

Mr. Sudarshan Singhal. ... Petitioner.
Versus
SBM Chemical & Instruments Pvt.Ltd. & ors. ... Respondents.

WITH
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 166 OF 2014

Mr. Sudarshan Singhal. ... Petitioner.
Versus
Ronash Consultants Developers and
Traders Pvt.Ltd. & ors. ... Respondents.

None for petitioner.

Mr. V.B. Konde-Deshmukh, APP for State.

CORAM : SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV, J
DATE : JULY 18, 2016

P.C.:

1 None present for the petitioner. This Court by an order dated 27/1/2014 had made it clear that the pendency of these petitions shall not be construed as a stay to the proceedings in C.C. No. 3017/SS/2012, C.C. No. 2977/SS/2012 and C.C. No. 3195/SS/2012 pending before the Metropolitan Magistrate, 7th Court, Dadar, Mumbai.

2 The office objections were not removed. On 3rd March, 2014, this Court had directed that in the eventuality, the office objections are not removed, the matter shall stand dismissed for want of prosecution. Accordingly, on 27/2/2014, since the office objections were not removed, the matter was sent to Criminal “B” Branch for further action. By an order dated 28/7/2014, the matter was restored to its original status.

3 Thereafter, on 11th March, 2016 this Court had again observed that none appeared for the petitioner and the learned Counsel for the petitioner was directed to take appropriate steps, upon failure, the matter would stand dismissed for want of prosecution. The same order was reiterated on 16/6/2016.

4 Today, none appears for the petitioner. Office note shows that the notices issued to respondent Nos. 2 to 10 returned unserved with postal remark that the notices belong to Indore Court, hence not taken by Jabalpur High Court. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has not complied with the order dated 16/6/2016 and hence, the petition stands dismissed against the respondent Nos. 2 to 10.

5 In view of the above, it appears that the petitioner is not interested in prosecuting the matter. Hence, the petitions stand dismissed for want of prosecution.

(SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV, J)