

\$~25, 26,28, 30

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

+ **CRL.REV.P. 479/2019**

EKTA VERMA Petitioner

Through Mr Rahul Kumar, Advocate.

versus

MOHAN GEMS JEWELS PVT LTD & ORS. Respondents

Through Mr Nitin Nayyar, Advocate for R.1.

26.

+ **CRL.REV.P. 480/2019**

EKTA VERMA Petitioner

Through Mr Rahul Kumar, Advocate.

versus

MOHAN GEMS JEWELS PVT LTD & ORS. Respondents

Through Mr Nitin Nayyar, Advocate for R.1.

28.

+ **CRL.REV.P. 485/2019**

EKTA VERMA Petitioner

Through Mr Rahul Kumar, Advocate.

versus

MOHAN GEMS JEWELS PVT LTD & ORS. Respondents

Through Mr Nitin Nayyar, Advocate for R.1.

30.

+ **CRL.REV.P. 487/2019**

EKTA VERMA Petitioner

Through Mr Rahul Kumar, Advocate.

versus

MOHAN GEMS JEWELS PVT LTD & ORS. Respondents
Through Mr Nitin Nayyar, Advocate for R.1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

27.01.2020

1. The petitioner has filed the present petitions, *inter alia*, impugning a common order dated 02.07.2015 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate in CC No. 1170/1/14 (New No. 526419/16) in Crl. Rev. P. 479/2019; CC No. 1171/1/14 (New No. 526418/16) in Crl. Rev. P. 480/2019; CC No. 1173/1/14 (New No. 526390/16) in Crl. Rev. P. 487/2019; and CC No. 1175/1/14 (New No. 526388/16) in Crl. Rev. P. 485/2019, whereby directions have been issued for notices to be framed.
2. It is seen that the present petitions are hopelessly barred by limitation as they have been filed on 15.0.2019. The present petitions are also not accompanied by any application seeking condonation of delay.
3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that the delay ought to be condoned because the petitioner had filed six other petitions (Crl. Rev. P. 83/2019 to Crl. Rev. P. 88/2019), that were dismissed as withdrawn on 15.03.2019, with liberty to file fresh petitions impugning the order for framing of the notices. He states that those petitions were preferred against orders rejecting applications filed by the petitioners seeking discharge.
4. It is apparent from the above that this Court had not observed that the delay in filing the fresh petitions be condoned. It is also pointed out that

those petitions were also belated.

5. Be that as it may, since no application has been filed for seeking condonation of delay and it is apparent that the present petitions are hopelessly barred by limitation, the same are dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JANUARY 27, 2020

pkv