

26# \$~

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2390/2017**

UJALA NEWS NETWORK DELHI & ORS Petitioners

Represented by: **R.K. Bharti, Advocate.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Represented by: **Ms. Madhuri Dhingra and Ms. Soumaya Karmakar, Advocate for Mr. Ajay Digpaul, CGSC for respondent Nos. 1 and 2. Mr. R.S. Kundu, Additional Standing Counsel for State with Ms. Suman Saharan, Advocate with SI Neeraj Kumar, ISC, Crime Branch, Chankyapuri.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

30.08.2018

%

1. Mr. R.K. Bharti, Advocate seeks discharge from the matter as he has no instructions from the petitioners.
 2. A perusal of the order sheets reveals that on 23rd August, 2017 when the petition filed by Shri R.K. Bharti, Advocate came up for the first time before this Court the petitioner, that is, Sanjay Kumar Tiwari appeared in person and sought an adjournment as learned counsel was not available. This Court renotified the matter for 30th October, 2017.
 3. On 30th October, 2017 Mr. Baban Kumar Sharma and Mr. Shahid Ali, Advocates appeared. Along with them, Mr. Rohit Kaul, Advocate also
- W.P.(CRL) 2390/2017**

appeared and sought to withdraw his vakalatnama and deletion of his name from the file. This Court permitted Mr. Rohit Kaul to withdraw his vakalatnama and his name was directed to be deleted from the file. Mr. Baban Kumar Sharma, Advocate stated that he had recently been engaged in the matter and so as to make himself aware of the facts of the case sought an adjournment and time for filing the vakalatnama in the Registry. Writ petition was renotified for 22nd January, 2018.

4. On 22nd January, 2018 Mr. Baban Kumar Sharma, Advocate appeared, however, his vakalatnama was not on record and thus the matter had to be adjourned to 16th March, 2018.

5. On 16th March, 2018 Sanjay Kumar Tiwari, petitioner No.2 appeared in person along with Mr. Baban Kumar Sharma, Advocate and stated that Mr. Shahid Ali, Advocate was contesting elections for the Bar Council of Delhi and thus the matter be adjourned. This Court noted that no notice in the petition has been issued as yet however, on the request of petitioner No.2 renotified the matter for 11th July, 2018.

6. On 11th July, 2018 Mr. R.K. Bharti Advocate appeared and again sought for an adjournment and thus the matter was posted for today.

7. Today Mr. R.K. Bharti, Advocate submits that he has no instructions from the petitioners and thus he be discharged from the matter.

8. In view of the facts noted above, as the petition is not being pursued by the petitioners and for the last five dates adjournment is being sought on one pretext or the other, petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

**AUGUST 30, 2018/‘vn’
W.P.(CRL) 2390/2017**

Page 2 of 2