



**274 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-20922-2024
DECIDED ON:02.07.2024**

IMRAN KHAN ALIAS MOHD IMRAN

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been invoked seeking quashing of the order dated 21.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) passed by Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana in case FIR No. 137, dated 05.12.2021, under Sections 323, 427, 452, 307, 506, 511, 148, 149, 120-B IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Meharban, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.

2. Considering the assertion made on behalf of the petitioner that he was regularly appearing before the trial Court but his application for exemption moved on 21.02.2024 was dismissed, as a result of which the impugned order came to be passed, notice of motion was issued and he was directed to surrender before the trial Court within a period of one week from the date of passing of the

order, subject to deposit of Rs.25,000/- as costs and on doing so, he shall be admitted to interim bail to the satisfaction of trial Court.

CRM-M-20922-2024

-2-

3. Now, the proclamation issued against the petitioner-accused has been received back duly executed but due to lack of 30 days statutory period, the matter was adjourned for 07.06.2024 to await the presence of the petitioner-accused. Again on 07.06.2024, the petitioner accused remained abesent.

4. On 13.05.2024, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court passed the following order:

“ This is an application seeking exemption of time to adhere to the order dated 29.04.2024.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. The applicant-petitioner is granted one week's more time to comply with the afore-said order.

This CRM application is disposed of.”

5. In compliance of the afore-said order, the petitioner yet again failed to comply with the order dated 29.04.2024. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner at the same time learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner has not surrendered before the trial Court yet, which is sufficient for this Court to infer that the petitioner does not want to pursue with the present petition.

6. In the light of above, this Court is left with no other option just to dismiss the present petition for non-prosecution, at this stage.

7. Dismissed for non-prosecution.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

02.07.2024

Sham

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>