

\$~1

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 2138/2017 & CRL.M.B. 1374/2017

SANJEEV KUMAR JHA

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr.Subhash C.Bhuttan, Advocate.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through : Mr.Sanjay Lao, ASC for the State
with SI Ram Bhau, PS Khyala.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% **10.08.2017**

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 24th March, 2017, whereby his request for preponement of date has been rejected by the learned trial Court for the following reasons:-

“As regards, the preponement of the date of hearing for recording the statements of the remaining public witnesses, short date is not possible as dates uptill February, 2018 have already been given for evidence of prosecutrix in the other cases, as the pendency of cases in this Court, as on 23.05.2015, is 962 sessions cases with 827 cases under the POCSO Act and 133 cases in which the victims are children. Now, the dates of March, 2018 are being given for PE due to the above elaborated facts.”

2. A report was called from the learned trial Court to ascertain that out of the total pendency of 962 cases (out of which 827 cases are under POCSO Act) in how many cases accused persons are in judicial custody.

3. The report has not been received till date. At this stage, since the issue involved is affecting large number of inmates and not only the petitioner, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw this petition with liberty to raise this issue either on the administrative side of this Court or to seek any other remedy as may be available to the petitioner.
4. Dismissed as withdrawn.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

AUGUST 10, 2017
'srb'