

\$~27

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CRL.M.C. 552/2016

BEDI RAM GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Raj Kishore Choudhary and
Mr. Anupam Bhati, Advs.

versus

STATE & ORS

..... Respondents

Represented by: Mr. Satya Narayan Vashishth,
APP for State with ASI Rajbir Singh, PS-Sadar
Bazar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESH KAIT

ORDER

%

09.02.2016

Crl.M.A. 2312/2016 (for exemption)

Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Accordingly, the application is allowed.

+ **CRL.M.C. 552/2016**

1. Vide the present petition, petitioner seeks directions thereby directing the trial court to expedite the case FIR No. 439/2007, registered at PS-Sadar Bazar for the offences punishable under Sections 409/120B IPC.
2. Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that in the aforesaid case challan was filed on 01.05.2009 and the Trial Court framed charges against the accused persons on 22.05.2013.
3. Being aggrieved, the accused persons filed a Revision against the

order dated 22.05.2013. Same was dismissed vide order dated 07.05.2014.

4. Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is an old aged person of 70 years and suffering with health problems and the act done by the accused persons is grievous in nature but the trial court did not pay heed to consider the factum of the age of the petitioner.

5. The order sheets dated 14.05.2015 and 26.10.2015 produced by the ld. APP for the State reveal that no PW was present on both the dates. Moreover, on 26.10.2015, ld. Presiding Officer had gone to Tihar Jail Duty as per the order NO. 8320-8337 CMM/Central/SS/2015 dated 20.10.2015. Thus, it does not seem that after framing of charges, ld. Trial Court has not paid any heed. However, the petitioner has a right to expedite the trial.

6. Therefore, this Court expects from the Trial Court to conclude the trial expeditiously.

7. Accordingly, the petition is allowed.

SURESH KAIT, J

FEBRUARY 09, 2016

jg