

\$~35

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

+ CRL.REV.P. 243/2017 & Crl.M.A.5509/2017

STATE

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP with
Inspector Karamvir Singh PS I. P.
Esate and SI Kulbir PS EOW, New
Delhi.

versus

ANIL KUMAR

..... Respondent

Through : None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

30.03.2017

Crl.M.A.5508/2017 (Delay)

There is a delay of seven months in filing the revision petition. To explain the delay routine plea has been taken that it took time for taking decision to file the revision petition against the impugned order dated 31st May, 2016. It is contended that Additional Public Prosecutor prepared a report on 18th June, 2016. Thereafter, Chief Prosecutor gave opinion on 18th June, 2016 to file the revision. File was sent to the Director of Prosecution on 2nd July, 2016, who in turn forwarded the file to Principal Secretary on 11th July, 2016. File was received back by Director of Prosecution on 21st September, 2016, who forwarded the same to the Office of Standing Counsel on 27th September, 2016. Thereafter, revision petition has been

filed in the month of March, 2017. Thus, it is clear that prompt decisions were not taken regarding filing of revision petition and file did not move promptly. Reasons are not sufficient to justify the delay of seven months.

Application is dismissed. Subsequently, revision petition is dismissed being time barred. Miscellaneous application is disposed of as infructuous.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

MARCH 30, 2017/dk