



\$~34 to 38

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 2443/2021

SHANKAR PRASADPetitioner

Through: Mr. Kamlesh Kamal, Advocate.
versus

BSES RAJDHANI POWER LIMITEDRespondent

Through: Counsel for Respondent (appearance
not given)

35

+ W.P.(CRL) 397/2022, CRL.M.A. 3379/2022

AMIT PRASADPetitioner

Through: Mr. Kamlesh Kamal, Advocate.
versus

BSES RAJDHANI POWER LTD.Respondent

Through: Counsel for Respondent (appearance
not given)

36

+ W.P.(CRL) 2827/2023, CRL.M.A. 26332/2023

AMIT PRASADPetitioner

Through: Mr. Kamlesh Kamal, Advocate.
versus

BSES RAJDHANI POWER LIMITEDRespondent

Through: Counsel for Respondent (appearance
not given)

37

+ W.P.(CRL) 2828/2023, CRL.M.A. 26334/2023

AMIT PRASADPetitioner

Through: Mr. Kamlesh Kamal, Advocate.
versus

BSES RAJDHANI POWER LIMITEDRespondent

Through: Counsel for Respondent (appearance
not given)



not given)

38

+ W.P.(CRL) 496/2023, CRL.M.A. 4556/2023

AMIT PRASAD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kamlesh Kamal, Advocate.
versus

BSES RAJDHANI POWER LIMITED

.....Respondent

Through: Counsel for Respondent (appearance
not given)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

10.03.2025

CRL.M.A. 1132/2025 (For Restoration) in W.P.(CRL) 2443/2021
W.P.(CRL) 397/2022, W.P.(CRL) 2827/2023, W.P.(CRL) 2828/2023 &
W.P.(CRL) 496/2023

1. An adjournment is sought by learned counsel for the Petitioners on the ground that the arguing counsel is not well.
2. The record shows that an Application bearing CRL.M.A. 1132/2025 under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*hereinafter referred to as 'B.N.S.S.'*) has been filed for restoration of the Writ Petition bearing W.P.(CRL) 2443/2021, which got disposed on 22.11.2024, on the statement of the learned Counsel that he has instructions to state that the Petition has become infructuous, on account of demise of the Petitioner, Mr. Shankar Prasad. However, now it is being stated in the Application that the Petitioner No. 2 is still alive and competent to peruse the Petition. Interestingly, the same Counsel, who was appearing for both the Petitioners, made a Statement without being conscious of the presence of



the Petitioner No. 2 and is now seeking a recall of the Order dated 22.11.2024.

3. The Petitioner No. 2 is directed to appear in person on the next date of hearing i.e. 12.03.2025.

4. List on 12.03.2025.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

MARCH 10, 2025/RS