



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-40141-2023

Date of Decision: 05.05.2026

RAJIV JOHRI AND OTHERS

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Nitin Sansanwal, Advocate for
Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramesh Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of the FIR No.13 dated 14.05.2012 under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 120-B of IPC, 1860 and 13(1) D, PC Act, 1988 registered at Police Station State Vigilance Bureau Gurugram, District Palwal.

On 04.09.2023, the following order was passed:-

“In compliance of order dated 01.09.2023 counsel for the petitioners placed on record detail of paid up share capital today in the Court, which is taken on record. Copy of the same has been supplied to State counsel.

List on 06.11.2023.

State to file reply by the next date of hearing.

The petitioners are permitted to appear before the trial Court subject to the condition that the petitioners shall not claim any prejudice in this regard in any Court. Trial Court shall not insist the petitioners for appearance except the dates when their appearance would be necessary. It is clarified that the petitioners shall not seek any adjournment before the trial Court.”

Thereafter, on 06.11.2023, the following order was passed:-

“On joint request, list for final hearing on 19.02.2024.

Counter, if any, be filed by the next date positively.

It is clarified that no further adjournment shall be granted.

Interim order dated 04.09.2023, to continue till the next date of hearing.”

On 19.02.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Bar is abstaining from work and have requested by passing a resolution not to pass any adverse orders for non-appearance of advocates.

Given above, list on 18.03.2024.

Interim order to continue till the next date of hearing.”

On 18.03.2024, the following order was passed:-

“List on 01.04.2024.

It is clarified that this Court has not issued notice as of date, as such, pendency of this petition shall be inconsequential.

Interim order dated 04.09.2023 to continue.”

On 01.04.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Notice served upon the official respondent(s) through the state counsel.

List on 21.10.2024.

Reply/status report be filed in the meantime.

Interim order to continue.”

On 19.08.2025, the following order was passed:-

“The interim order dated 04.09.2023 stands vacated.

The petitioners are directed to appear before the Trial Court to face trial.

Adjourned to 06.11.2025.”

On 06.11.2025, the following order was passed:-

“The Trial Court is directed to send a report to this Court as to the stage of the trial pending before it.

Adjourned to 03.12.2025.

It is made clear that in case the learned counsel for the petitioner does not appear on the next date of hearing to argue the matter, an amicus curiae shall be appointed and the case shall be heard on merits.

Interim order to continue.”

An adjournment is being sought when the counsel has asked to argue the case, despite the fact that there is no order staying the proceedings before the Trial Court and the petitioners were asked to appear before the said Court for further proceedings to be conducted, they have deliberately chosen not to do so. The report of ASJ, Palwal reveals that out of 37 accused persons, 05 accused have moved applications for exemption. Apparently, the intention is to delay the Trial. The conduct of the petitioners does not entitle them to any relief from this Court.

In view of the above, I find no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

May 05, 2026

vishal

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No