

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

113

CRR No.4492 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision:1.6.2018

Satyawan

... Petitioner

versus

Vikas and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH.

Present: Mr.S.S.Duhan, Advocate,
for the petitioner
Mr.D.P.S. Bajwa, Advocate,
for respondent no.1.
Mr.Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana
...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Vide an order dated 4.12.2017, this Court (coordinate bench)
had passed the following order:-

“After hearing the learned counsel for revisionist, when
this Court finds no merit in revision, the learned counsel for
revisionist seeks time to settle the dispute with respondent.

List on 11.1.2018.”

On the next date of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner
had submitted that since the wife of the petitioner could not settle the matter
with the complainant, therefore the petitioner may be given a chance to do
the needful by suspending his sentence.

Consequently, the matter had been adjourned to 29.1.2018,
with the petitioner ordered to be admitted to interim bail to the satisfaction
of the CJM/Duty Magistrate, Jind, till the next date of hearing of this case,
i.e. 29.1.2018.

On that date, learned counsel for the petitioner had stated that the petitioner had put up his house for sale from the proceeds of which he would pay Rs.10.00 lacs as awarded by the Courts below to the complainant, if he is given 2 months' time to do the needful.

Consequently, the matter had then been adjourned to 2.4.2018 to enable the petitioner to sell his house and settle the matter with the complainant, with the interim order continued in his favour.

On 2.4.2018, a request for adjournment had been made, with the matter adjourned to 17.4.2018 and the interim order again continued.

On 17.4.2018, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it would take about 4 weeks more for the petitioner to raise the money to pay the complainant and therefore he may be granted that much time.

Learned counsel for respondent no. 1 (complainant) at that time did not oppose the adjournment and continuation of the suspension of sentence granted to the petitioner simply because he wanted to recover the money. Consequently, the petition had been adjourned to 31.5.2018, with the interim order continued till that date only.

Yesterday (31.5.2018), when the matter came up for hearing, a request for adjournment was made on behalf of learned counsel for the petitioner, on the ground that he was out of station.

Consequently, the matter was adjourned till today, it being obvious to this Court that the petitioner was simply trying to get the matter postponed, he not having arranged for the money.

Today, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the

petitioner has not been able to arrange for the money and settle the matter with the complainant.

Consequently, this Court (coordinate bench) already having expressed its opinion on the first date of hearing itself, i.e. about 6 months ago, that there is no merit in this petition, I see no reason to entertain the same.

Dismissed.

Interim order stands vacated. The petitioner be taken into custody forthwith to serve out the remaining part of his sentence.

1.6.2018
pk/nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
Yes