



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANAAT CHANDIGARH
114

CRM-A-1591-MA-2014 (O&M)
Decided on : 15.05.2025

Sunita Sharma

... Applicant(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel)
for the applicant-appellant.

Mr. Ram Pal Verma, Advocate
for the applicant-appellant.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present application i.e. CRM-A-1591-MA-2014, has been filed by the applicant – Sunita Sharma (complainant), filed under Section 378(4) of Cr.P.C. for grant of special leave to appeal against the judgment of acquittal dated 25.02.2014, passed by Ld. Judicial Magistrate First Class, Sonipat, in Criminal Complaint No.394 of 2008-2012, filed under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 120-B of IPC, Police Station City Sonipat.

2. It has been alleged by the complainant in the complaint filed before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sonipat, that cheque bearing No. 0764302, dated 30th June, 2008, for an amount of Rs. 2.00 lakh, was dishonoured. Consequently, the complainant (applicant herein) instituted the present complaint. However, vide judgment dated 25.02.2014, the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sonipat, dismissed the complaint and acquitted the accused – Maya Devi, of the charges framed against her. Hence, the present application, i.e., CRM-A-1591-MA-2014, has been filed under Section 378(4)

Cr.P.C. seeking special leave to appeal against the judgment of acquittal dated 25.02.2014.

3. There is another application i.e. CRM-31814-2014, seeking condonation of delay of 149 days in filing the appeal, i.e., special leave to appeal. Notice in the application for condonation of delay was issued on 06.04.2015, but till date, applicant has failed in affecting service upon respondent No.2 (accused in the complaint case), on account of incorrect address.

Not only this, applicant herself could not get the service effected through *dasti* notice, upon respondent No.2 till date. Even today, Mr. Ram Pal Verma, learned counsel for the applicant, submits that neither he is in a position to collect the latest address of respondent No.2, nor he is aware of the life status of respondent No.2.

4. Considering the aspects that present application for seeking condonation of delay of 149 days, is pending consideration since the time of filing of application seeking special leave to appeal, i.e., from the year 2014, this Court is left with no other option, except to dispose of the same for the reason of non-prosecution.

5. Dismissed for want of prosecution.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 15, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No