

Crl.M.P.Nos.9376 to 9389 of 2016
in
Crl.Rc.SR.Nos.37698,37688,37704,37708,37696,37706,37700,37702,37712,37692
,37710,37741,37694 and 37690 of 2016

S.BASKARAN, J.

These petitions have been filed to condone the delay of 112 days in filing the appeal against the orders of discharge passed by the trial Court.

2. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the impugned order was passed by the trial Court on 28.01.2016 and application for the certified copy was made on 10.02.2016 according to the prosecution the delay occurred only due to time taken to get necessary permission by the authority concerned to file the criminal revision.

3. On the other hand the learned counsel for the respondent opposed to the petition on the ground that the delay has not properly explained. He also relied upon judgment in the Apex Court reported in Indian Kanoon, Office of the Chief Post Master General & others Vs.Living Media India Ltd & another (Civil Appeal No.2474-2475 of 2012 (Arising out of SLP(C) Nos.7595-96 of 2011, dated 24.02.2012).

S.BASKARAN,J.,

nvi

4. However, considering the statement made by the Public Prosecutor, it is apparent that delay occurred only due to the procedure aspects in getting necessary clearance by filing the revision. Even though, it is asserted by the petitioner that in similar matters already conclusion in arrived at in favour of the accused in the main case, it can be decided only at the time of admission and subsequent hearings.

5. In the result, the delay is condoned. The Registry is directed to number the appeal, if otherwise in order.

11.01.2017

nvi

Crl.M.P.Nos.9376 to 9389 of 2016 in
Crl.Rc.SR.Nos.37698,37688,37704,37708,37696,37706,37700,37702,37712,
37692,37710,37714,37694 and 37690 of 2016
<http://www.judis.nic.in>