

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

106

CRWP no.6054 of 2020

Date of decision:2.9.2020

Ravinder Singh

... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

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

Present: None for the petitioner

...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

All cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

On 25.8.2020, the following order had been passed:-

“All cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

By this petition, the petitioner seeks protection of his life and liberty at the hands of respondents no.4 to 6 and also seeks a direction that he be not harassed on any false criminal complaint lodged by the said respondents against him.

On the last date of hearing that this petition was listed, i.e. 18.8.2020, learned counsel had informed the coordinator of the video conference that he was seeking an adjournment, with the matter adjourned till today.

Today again, the Reader of this court informs me that he has sought yet another adjournment.

Adjourned for the last time to 2.9.2020, with it made clear that any request for an adjournment on that date will result in “automatic” dismissal of the petition for want of

prosecution, with no further order required to be passed in that regard.”

Today again, a request for an adjournment has been made by learned counsel for the petitioner to the coordinator of the video conference, this time stating that he is unwell.

It already having been made clear even on the last date of hearing that any request for an adjournment would result in dismissal of the petition for want of prosecution, without any further order required to be passed in that regard, I see no reason to entertain this petition any longer because even if it is presumed that the counsel is making a correct statement to the effect that he is unwell, alternative arrangements should have been made by him.

Obviously, though normally on any request for an adjournment on the ground that the counsel is unwell, this court would adjourn the matter, but looking at the fact that this is the third time that an adjournment has been sought, naturally counsel should have made alternative arrangements especially looking at the last order passed passed by this court.

Therefore, implementing the order passed on 25.8.2020, this petition is dismissed for want of prosecution.

2.9.2020
pk

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No