

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

INCOMP No. 384 of 2025
Date of Decision: 19.03.2025

Mubin @ Ragda

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, D.A.G., Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

The aforesaid petition was filed on 06.09.2024 by Mr. Vimal Kumar Gupta, Advocate. The Registry had raised objection on the case file.

2. On the last date of hearing, none appeared on behalf of the petitioner and even today petitioner is unrepresented.

3. As per Rule 9, Chapter 1, Part-A, Volume V, Punjab and Haryana High Court Rules and Orders, the petition on which objections have been raised by the Registry is to be taken back by the counsel/party, who filed it, to be re-filed within a total period of 40 days. The same was not taken back for re-filing after removal of objections. On failure, the case is to be listed before the Court for orders. Note was published by the Registry in the cause list, whereby the advocates were requested to collect their all cases lying with objections for re-filing after removal of objections.

4. It was further notified that all pending cases of this type will be listed in Court for appropriate order. The case was shown in the cause list. No one was present on behalf of the petitioner on the last date, nor today. Keeping in view the aforesaid factual matrix, no further order is required to be passed and the same is **disposed of.**

5. In parting, the concerned District Legal Authority is directed to contact the petitioner in the present case and apprise him of his legal rights to file an appropriate application for bail, if he is still in custody, either before the Sessions Court concerned or before this Court. Further in case the petitioner needs assistance of legal aid counsel, the same shall be provided to him in accordance with law.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

19.03.2025

Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No.