

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

INCOMP No. 221 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 07.03.2025

Mosim ...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.**

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
113	25.06.2023	Palwal, District Palwal	22-B of NDPS Act

The aforesaid petition was filed on 13.09.2024 by Mr. Salman Ahmed, Advocate. The Registry had raised objection on the case file.

2. 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.

3. 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. On the last date of hearing, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Same is the position today also. Keeping in view the aforesaid factual matrix, no further order is required to be passed and the same is disposed of. Liberty reserved to the petitioners to approach this Court again, if need arises.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

07.03.2025

Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No.