

2025:PHHC:018625



203.

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

CRM-M-7607-2024

Date of decision: 07.02.2025

Bhinder Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

There is no representation for the petitioner when the matter is called. On the previous dates also, same was the position. It would be pertinent to reproduce all the previous orders w.e.f. 28.02.2024 passed by this Court wherein it stands reflected that either none has entered appearance on behalf of the petitioner or request had been made for adjournment.

The previous orders w.e.f. 28.02.2024 are reproduced hereinunder:-

“Present: Ms. Gagan, Advocate
for Mr. Pardeep Kumar Kapila, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

CRM-7058-2024

xxx

xxx

CRM-M-7607-2024

Adjourned to 10.04.2024.
February 28th, 2024”

“Present: Mr. Pardeep Kumar Kapila, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

On request of learned counsel for the petitioner, case is
adjourned to 24.04.2024.

To be heard with CRM-M-55947-2023.”

10.04. 2024”

“Present: Ms. Mandeep Kaur, Advocate
for Ms. B.S. Jatana, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-55947-2023).

Ms. Kamlesh, Advocate
for Mr. Pardeep Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-7607-2024).

Request for adjournment has been made on behalf of the
learned counsel for the petitioner.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 18.07.2024.

Copy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

April 24th, 2024”

“Present: Mr. Bikramjeet S. Jatana & Mr. Pardeep K. Kapila,
Advocates for the petitioners.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

Learned counsel for the petitioners have yet again prayed
for an adjournment to place on record zimni orders of the trial Court. It
has been submitted that the trial has been proceeding at a very slow pace
and on as many as 8 dates the prosecution has sought an adjournment.

On request, adjourned to 25.07.2024.

It is made clear that no further adjournment shall be
granted under any circumstances.

A copy of this order be placed in the file of connected
case.

July 18, 2024”

“Present: Ms. Mandeep Kaur, Advocate for
Mr.B.K. Jatana, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-55947-2024.

Mr. Pardeep Kumar Kapila, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-7607-2024.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

On request of learned counsel for the petitioner in CRM-M-55947-2024, case is adjourned to 23.09.2024.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

25.07.2024”

“Present: Mr. B.S. Jatana, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Navdeep Singh, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab for the respondent/State.

A request for adjournment has been made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

On request, adjourned to 13.11.2024.

A copy of this order be placed in the file of connected case.

September 23, 2024”

Present: Mr. Pardeep Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

On request of learned counsel for the petitioner, case is adjourned to 21.11.2024.

13.11.2024”

“Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

A written request for an adjournment has been circulated on behalf of learned counsel for the petitioner.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 04.02.2025.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

November 21, 2024”

Present: None for the petitioner.
Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

* * * *

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Same was the position on the last date of hearing.

However, purely in the interest of justice, adjourned to 07.02.2025.

No further adjournment shall be granted.

4th February, 2025”

In almost identical circumstances, the Hon’ble Supreme Court in an order dated 19.11.2024 passed in special leave petition (criminal) diary No.22040/2024 titled as *Nilesh Dnyaneshwar Desale Versus The State of Maharashtra*, rejected the request for another adjournment, as earlier the petitioner therein had sought adjournment thrice, and dismissed the said petition for want of prosecution.

The present petition also stands dismissed for non-prosecution in view of the repeated requests for adjournments/non-appearances of learned counsel for the petitioner.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

February 07, 2025
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No