



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

263

CRM-M-26994-2019

Date of decision: 20.03.2025

SATPAL AND ANR.

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Yuvraj Singh Tiwana, AAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for setting aside the order dated 11.10.2018 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana (Annexure P-3) whereby the opportunity to cross-examine PW-5 Bhajan Singh (Investigating Officer) has been ordered to be treated as nil and order dated 19.1.2019 (Annexure P-5) whereby application under Section 311 Cr.P.C. for recalling the said PW-5 for his cross-examination in FIR No.307 dated 01.09.2015 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 323, 354, 341, 506 & 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Jodhewal, District Ludhiana was dismissed.

2. On 12.08.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for setting aside the order dated 11.10.2018 (Annexure P-3), passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, whereby the opportunity to cross examine PW-5 Bhajan Singh (Investigating Officer), was ordered to be treated as ‘NIL’; and order dated 19.01.2019 (Annexure P-5) vide which the

application filed under Section 311 Cr.P.C. for recalling the said PW-Bhajan Singh, in case FIR No. 307 dated 01.09.2015 registered under Sections 323, 354, 341 and 506 read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station Jodhewal, District Ludhaina, was dismissed.

Perusal of the order-sheets shows that on the last date of hearing i.e. 05.03.2020, the petitioners have gone unrepresented. Today also, there is no representation on behalf of petitioners, despite the case having been called twice.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 20.03.2025.

It is, however, made clear that in case, none appear on behalf of the petitioners on the next date of hearing, then the instant petition shall be deemed to be dismissed on merits.”

3. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioners even today. It appears that the petitioners are not interested in pursuing the present petition.
4. In view of the above, the instant petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

20.03.2025

Nisha Yadav

**(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE**

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