

CRM-M-11128-2021

Date of Decision:07.07.2021

Ranjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGHPresent: Mr.Satbir Singh Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, DAG, Punjab

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Case heard via video conference.

On 22.03.2021, the following order had been passed:-

“Case heard by way of video conferencing.

On 10.03.2021, the following order had been passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the occurrence is shown to be of 15.11.2020 and the injured complainant (Jasbir Kaur), is stated to have gone to the hospital on the same night/day, the MLR is only of 6 days later, showing a grievous injury on her forehead.

Learned State counsel seeks time to take instructions in that regard.

A gazetted officer is directed to file a reply to the petition, with the complainant in the FIR, i.e. Jasbir Kaur wife of Gurdeep Singh, resident of Village Muradpura Kamboj, District Amritsar (Rural), (as taken from the FIR itself), ordered to impleaded as respondent no.2 in the petition, with the Registry directed to carry out the necessary correction the memo of parties.

Notice be issued to said respondent no.2, returnable on 22.03.2021.”

Learned State counsel seeks further time to file an affidavit of a gazetted officer.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has also requested for an adjournment through the coordinator of the video conference.

Though the request cannot be refused, it is to be noticed here that as per the report of the Registry even the process fee was not filed by the counsel for the petitioner, for service of notice upon respondent no.2.

That being so, notice be now issued to respondent no.2, returnable on 07.07.2021, with it made clear that if the process fee is still not filed, the petition would be liable to be dismissed on the next date of hearing.

To be shown in the urgent motion list, with it made clear that there is no interim order operating in favour of the petitioner.”

Despite the above, the report of the Registry again is to the effect that no process fee has still been filed for issuing notice to respondent no.2.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in fact the petitioner has not contacted him at all and he is not even aware whether he has been arrested or not.

That being so, with the petitioner obviously no longer interested in pursuing this petition, without making any comment on the merits thereof, it is dismissed for non-prosecution.

July 07, 2021

dharamvir

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES/NO

Whether Reportable : YES/NO