



\$~42

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 7342/2023
SUBHASH CHANDERPetitioner
Through: Mr. Divanshu Sehgal, Adv.

versus

STATE GNCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for State
with SI Murari Lal, PS I.P. Estate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

%

17.09.2024

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner who is arrayed as an accused and summoned to face trial is aggrieved by the slow progress of the trial.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that though the present FIR came to be registered on 27.12.2010 in the context of filling up of vacancies for the post of Constable (Driver) in Delhi Police, but the charge-sheet came to be filed in the year 2018. He further submits that though 12 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution, but so far only four have been examined. He submits that the trial is not proceeding as the witnesses cited by the prosecution are not turning up for their examination.
3. Learned APP for the State while referring to the daily proceedings of the trial court, copy of which is also placed on record, submits that it is PW ARTO Mathura and PW Junior Clerk, ARTO Mathura, who could not be examined despite best efforts and evenailable warrants have been issued.
4. The trial court shall make an endeavour to examine the aforesaid two



witnesses as well as the other remaining witnesses at the earliest and consider taking all steps necessary for their presence before it. The Trial Court shall also make an endeavour to complete the trial within one year from the next date of hearing.

5. The petition is disposed of in above terms.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

SEPTEMBER 17, 2024

akc