

46# \$~

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2493/2016 and CrI. M.A. No. 10711/2016 (stay)

ANUJ KUMAR JAIN

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Rajendra Sahu and Mr.
Rishabh Sahu, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondents

Represented by: Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP for the
State with SI Vijay Kumar, PS
Farsh Bazar.
Mr. Vikas Arora, Advocate for
respondent No. 2 with
respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER
21.10.2016

%

1. Learned counsel for the respondent No.2 had pointed out that the English translation of the statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. of the complainant filed with the present petition was incorrect and thus learned counsel for the petitioner sought an adjournment to find out the correct position.

2. Today, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner was not supplied the complete statement by the complainant recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. which also includes allegations of the year 2015.

3. Faced with this situation learned counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the present petition and the application with liberty to take the

CRL.M.C. 2493/2016

Page 1 of 2

pleas at an appropriate stage.

4. Leave and liberty granted.
5. Petition and application are dismissed as withdrawn.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

OCTOBER 21, 2016

‘vn’