

31

3

\$~30 to 37

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **CRL.L.P. 315/2019**  
M/S BLS INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
versus  
M/S RAJWANT SINGH & ORS. .... Respondent  
Through Mr. Amit Punj, Adv for R1 to 4.

31

+ **CRL.L.P. 316/2019**  
M/S BLS INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
versus  
M/S RAJWANT SINGH & ORS. .... Respondent  
Through Mr. Amit Punj, Adv for R1 to 4.

32

+ **CRL.L.P. 317/2019**  
M/S BLS INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
versus  
M/S RAJWANT SINGH & ORS. .... Respondent  
Through Mr. Amit Punj, Adv for R1 to 4.

33

**CRL.L.P. 318/2019**  
M/S BLS INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
versus  
M/S RAJWANT SINGH & ORS .... Respondent  
Through Mr. Amit Punj, Adv for R1 to 4.

34

Signature Not Verified

Signing Date:19.10.2024 16:54:39  
Certify that the digital and physical file have  
been compared and the digital data is as per  
the physical file and no page is missing.

u

+ **CRL.L.P. 319/2019**  
M/S BLS INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
versus  
M/S RAJWANT SINGH & ORS ..... Respondent  
Through Mr. Amit Punj, Adv for R1 to 4.

35

+ **CRL.L.P. 320/2019**  
M/S BLS INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
versus  
M/S RAJWANT SINGH & ORS ..... Respondent  
Through Mr. Amit Punj, Adv for R1 to 4.

36

+ **CRL.L.P. 321/2019**  
M/S BLS INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
versus  
M/S RAJWANT SINGH & ORS ..... Respondent  
Through Mr. Amit Punj, Adv for R1 to 4.

37

+ **CRL.L.P. 322/2019**  
M/S BLS INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
versus  
M/S RAJWANT SINGH & ORS ..... Respondents  
Through Mr. Amit Punj, Adv for R1 to 4.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU**

**ORDER**  
**07.11.2019**

%

1. The petitioner has filed the present batch of petitions seeking leave to appeal against separate orders dated 25.01.2019 passed by the learned MM, whereby the complaints filed by the petitioner, for dishonouring of cheques stated to have been issued by respondent no.1, were rejected.
2. It is seen that these complaints were rejected for the reason that none had been appearing on behalf of the petitioner for several dates.
3. It is not disputed that the complaints had been listed on several occasions but the petitioner remained unrepresented. On some occasions, the matter was adjourned as the counsel for the accused had submitted that the parties were attempting to compromise the matter. On one of the dates, it was also submitted that the parties had entered into a compromise.
4. The orders that have been produced in the present petition also clearly indicate that none had appeared for the complainant (petitioner herein). In the impugned orders, the learned Metropolitan Magistrate had noted that none had been present on behalf of the complainant for the past many dates. It is also noted that a cost of ₹2000/- had been imposed on the complainant for non-appearance on 15.11.2018. The said costs were also not deposited.
5. The only explanation provided by the petitioner is that its counsel had misled the petitioner into believing that the matters were being adjourned on account of the efforts of the parties to compromise the said complaints.
6. Considering that it is not disputed that neither the authorized

6

representative of the petitioner nor its counsel had appeared on several dates, this Court is unable to fault the orders impugned in this petition. The contention that the petitioner's counsel was solely responsible for non-representation is also unpersuasive. Concededly, it was also necessary for the petitioner's authorized representative to be present at the hearings. The orders passed by the Courts are now readily available online and the failure on the part of the petitioner's counsel to appear does not absolve the petitioner of its responsibility for ensuring that its complaint is diligently prosecuted.

7. In view of the above, these petitions seeking leave to appeal are unmerited and are rejected.



**VIBHU BAKHRU, J**

**NOVEMBER 07, 2019**

pkv

