



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

240

CRR-3316-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.01.2026

STATE REPRESENTED BY LM LAKRA DEPUTY CHIEF
CONTROLLER OF IMPORT & EXPORTS

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

OM PARKASH & OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - None for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Since no one was representing on behalf of the Deputy Chief Controller of Import & Exports, this Court vide order dated 13.10.2025, had directed the Registry to inform the Additional Solicitor General of India for ensuring the presence of the Counsel.

Despite, the report having been furnished by the Registry that the Additional Solicitor, Govt. of India has been informed about the pendency of the present case as well as the continued non-appearance of the Counsel, however, there is yet no representation on behalf of the said authority. In these circumstances, the matter is being considered on merits.

The instant revision petition alongwith the application bearing CRM-31824-2014 seeking condonation of delay of 448 days in filing the present revision petition has been examined. It is evident from a perusal of the application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act that the impugned

order in the present case was passed on 16.03.2013 by the Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, CBI Court Chandigarh whereby it was held that the Court lacked jurisdiction to take cognizance of the offences mentioned in the criminal complaint. Consequently, the complaint was ordered to be returned to the complainant for presentation before the competent Court, with an endorsement to that effect, as per provisions of Section 201 (A) Cr.P.C. It is also evident from a perusal of the application seeking condonation of delay that no cogent or satisfactory reasons had been furnished by the applicants for explaining the inordinate delay in instituting the present revision petition. The only explanation put-forth is that even though the impugned order was passed on 16.03.2013, however, the certified copy thereof was applied for on 12.04.2013 and the same was supplied on 17.04.2013. The matter was thereafter forwarded for seeking an opinion as to whether it is a fit case for filing of revision petition or not and on receipt thereof, the present revision petition has been filed. The reasons so assigned are highly vague, evasive and wholly insufficient and do not in any manner explain the huge delay of more than one year that has occasioned in institution of the present revision petition. In the absence of any justifiable cause or sufficient explanation, I find that no valid ground is made out for condonation of the delay. The application bearing CRM-31824-2014 seeking condonation of delay is accordingly dismissed. Consequently, the revision petition also stands dismissed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

JANUARY 12, 2026

Vishal Sharma

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