

2025:PHHC:070458



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-7977-2025

Date of decision: May 22, 2025

TEGA SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.4 dated 31.03.2024 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station NRI, District Moga (Annexure P-1).

2. The instant petition was filed on 18.01.2025. The previous orders passed in the instant case are reproduced hereinunder: -

“Learned State counsel has supplied a copy of the reply filed on 25.02.2025 to the counsel opposite, who prays for an adjournment to go through the same and thereafter make his submissions.

On his request, adjourned to 22.05.2025.

-08.05.2025

The case has been called, however, none has entered appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

Purely in the interest of justice, adjourned to 08.05.2025.

-24.04.2025

On request of learned counsel for the petitioner, adjourned to 24.04.2025.

-26.03.2025



A request for adjournment has been made on behalf of the arguing counsel for the petitioner.

Learned State counsel has filed short reply by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police (NRI), Moga, which is taken on record subject to just exceptions. Copy supplied to the counsel opposite in the Court today.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 26.03.2025.

-25.02.2025

Notice of motion for 25.02.2025.

-13.02.2025”

3. A perusal of the previous orders, which stand reproduced hereinabove, reveals that except on 13.02.2025, on each and every date of hearing, a request for adjournment had been made by the counsel for the petitioner except on 24.04.2025, when none entered appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

4. On the last date of hearing, an adjournment had been sought by learned counsel for the petitioner for going through the reply filed by the learned State counsel.

5. The case has been called today and yet again, none has entered appearance on behalf of the petitioner in the Court. It is, thus, evident that the case is being adjourned time and again, and the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the matter any further.

6. Even Hon'ble the Supreme Court on 19.11.2024, in ***Nilesh Dnyaneshwar Desale Versus The State of Maharashtra: SLP (Criminal) Diary No.22040/2024***, deprecated the practice of adjournments and dismissed the case for want of prosecution.

7. In the circumstances, the instant petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

May 22, 2025

Jaspreet Kaur

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*