

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRR-2534-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision : 14.07.2023

Gurnam Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Ms. Ishita Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

At the outset, counsel for the petitioner submits that she has no instructions as to whether order dated 07.02.2020 has been complied with or not.

2. On 07.02.2020, following order was passed:-

“Mr. G.S.Sandhu, Avocate has filed vakalatnama on behalf of respondent No.2. Same is taken on record. Be tagged at appropriate place.

There is written request for adjournment on behalf of learned counsel for petitioner on the ground that he is out of station.

The said written request cannot be entertained in view of order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 07.02.2019 passed in *Civil Appeal Nos.9142-9144 of 2010 (Ram Siromani Tripathi and others vs. State of U.T. and others)*.

Hence, request for adjournment is rejected.

Perusal of file shows that sentence of petitioner was suspended on depositing a demand draft of Rs.30,000/- in favour of respondent No.2-complainant.

As per report of Nodal Officer, Mediation & Conciliation Centre, District Legal Services Authority, Karnal, mediation failed.

Petitioner is directed to further deposit a sum of ₹30,000/- over and above ₹30,000/- already deposited towards 20% of the cheque amount in view of Section 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (inserted by Amendment Act, 2018) which has now been declared retrospective in nature by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Surinder Singh Deswal @ Col. S.S.Deswal and others vs. Virender Gandhi 2019 (3) RCR (Criminal) 186* within one month from today, failing which this revision petition shall be dismissed for want of prosecution.

Adjourned to 13.05.2020, for arguments and compliance of this order.”

3. Admittedly, the petitioner has not complied with the same.
4. Thus, in view of aforesaid order, the present revision petition is ordered to be dismissed.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

14.07.2023

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No