

\$~47

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3891/2018**

SUCHARITA SAHA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. A.K. Pandey, Adv.

versus

DEEPAK KUMAR

..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

% **03.08.2018**

Crl. M.A. 29245/2018

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Application is disposed of.

Crl. M.C. 3891/2018

Despite opportunity granted to the petitioner evidence was not led by her. On 17th December, 2016 petitioner closed defence evidence. Statement of petitioner to this effect was recorded by the trial court. Subsequently, application under Sections 311 and 315 Cr.P.C. were filed in the year 2018, that is, after more than one and a half year. Applications were dismissed by the trial court. Revision filed by the petitioner has also been dismissed by the Revisional Court.

That is how petitioner is before this Court by way of present petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 Cr.P.C.

Impugned order has been perused which indicates that petitioner did not lead evidence despite opportunities granted to her, inasmuch as, she voluntarily closed her evidence. I do not find any perversity in the impugned order where aforesaid applications have been dismissed.

Petition is dismissed. Miscellaneous applications are disposed of as infructuous.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

AUGUST 03, 2018

ga