

need to be gone into, but without even filing a reply to the charge-sheet, the petitioner has rushed to this Court through the present petition seeking the quashing thereof.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had earlier been charge-sheeted between the years 2000 and 2002 and one or two of the charges, out of a total of 14, in the impugned charge-sheet, pertain to that period and once the petitioner had not been charge-sheeted qua them in the earlier charge-sheets, he could not be charge-sheeted for these charges through the impugned charge-sheet.

This argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner cuts no ice with me. Even if some of the charges pertain to a period, for which the petitioner had been served charge-sheets on other counts earlier, there is no bar for him to be charge-sheeted for acts of omission and commission on his part for that period through the impugned charge-sheet, especially when for the delay in the issuance of impugned charge-sheet qua those charges, no prejudice has been shown.

The nature of charges levelled against the petitioner are serious and at this stage, warrant no interference by me, in exercise of extraordinary and discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

The petition is clearly premature.

Dismissed.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

May 17, 2016