

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

**CRM-A-15-MA of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 18.01.2016.**

Rakesh Sheokand

...Appellant

Versus

Charanjit Singh Grewal and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

- 1) *Whether Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
- 2) *To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
- 3) *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Present: Mr. Suvir Kumar, Advocate for the applicant.

Kuldip Singh, J.(Oral)

Challenge in the present application for leave to appeal is the judgment dated 04.02.2010 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurgaon vide which complaint filed by the petitioner under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, 201 read with Section 34 of IPC was dismissed for want of prosecution and accused was discharged.

Along with the application for leave to appeal, an application i.e. CRM No. 34 of 2015 for condonation of delay of 1703 days in filing the application for leave to appeal has been filed. It is stated that the company was under liquidation and Directors could not pursue the litigation.

In such circumstances, I am of the view that this

explanation does not constitute sufficient cause to condone such a huge delay of more than four and half years. Even if the company was under liquidation, some receiver might have been appointed, who could pursue the litigation. Therefore, the application for condonation of delay of 1703 days in filing the application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

Consequently, the application for leave to appeal also stands dismissed.

January 18, 2016.
kanchan

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE