

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

107)

Crl.Misc.No. M-29404 of 2020

Date of Decision: 09.04.2021

Roshan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

By this petition, filed under the provisions of Section 439 of the Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks the concession of 'regular bail', upon FIR No.06, dated 18.01.2020, having been registered at Police Station Women, Rohtak, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Sections 376, 506, 201, and 34 of the IPC, with Section 376 (2) thereof added subsequently in the FIR, and Section 6 of the Prevention of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

On April 05, 2021, the following order had been passed by this court reproducing therein the order dated 27.01.2021: :-

“On 27.01.2021, the following order had been passed by this court, reproducing therein the order earlier passed on 16.12.2020:-

“Case heard via video conferencing.

“On 16.12.2020, the following order had been passed by this court:-

“All the 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.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been named in a subsequent statement made by the prosecutrix 4 days after the initial complaint was made only against one person, i.e. Rajesh, and the petitioner has been implicated only because of a dispute between his family and that of the prosecutrix.

However, upon query as to the nature of the dispute, she is unable to answer.

On her request, adjourned to 27.01.2021.”

Today counsel for the petitioner has made a request for an adjournment through the co-ordinator of this video conference. Adjourned to 05.04.2021.”

Today on a date of physical hearing, none appears for the petitioner.

Adjourned for the last time to 09.04.2021.

To be shown in the urgent motion list, with it made clear that if counsel for the petitioner makes any request for an adjournment on that date or does not come present, the petition would be dismissed.”

After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not want to press this petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

09.04.20210
vcgarg

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No