Serial No. 9 Regular List

## HIGH COURT OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR AT JAMMU

SLAA 1/2016 c/w CONCR No.01/2016

Date of order: 30.11.2017

State of J&K vs Naushad Khan

## **Coram:**

Hon'ble Mr Justice Badar Durrez Ahmed, Chief Justice Hon'ble Mr Justice Sanjeev Kumar, Judge.

**Appearance:** 

For the appellant(s) : Mr S.S.Nanda, Sr. AAG.

For the Respondent(s)

i) Whether approved for reporting in Yes/No

Law journals etc.:

ii) Whether approved for publication

in press: Yes/No

## SLAA 1/2016 & CONCR No.01/2016

- From the various orders passed on these applications, it appears that the State is either not interested in pursuing this matter or unable to locate the respondent, who has been acquitted by the trial Court by virtue of the judgment dated 02.07.2014 of the charge under Section 302 RPC.
- On 18.05.2016, this Court had directed issuance of notice to the respondent, executable through the concerned SSP. The notice (as recorded in the next order dated 27.01.2017) was returned with the report that the respondent's whereabouts were not traceable. Accordingly, fresh notice was directed to be issued, executable through the SSP Jammu. On 19.04.2017, as the notice was yet not served on the respondent, the learned counsel for the State was directed to provide the complete address of the respondent within two weeks and it was directed that

the fresh notice be issued to the respondents thereafter, executable through the

Station House Officer of the concerned Police Station. The previous order had not

been complied with by the appellant-applicant, inasmuch the fresh particulars of

respondent were not provided.

3 On 06.09.2016, this Court once again directed that the needful be done in

terms of the order dated 19.04.2017 within three weeks and directed the listing of

the matter in the week commencing 03.10.2017. Even thereafter, the same was

not done. As such, the Court directed, on 05.10.2017, that fresh particulars in

terms of the previous order be furnished within a period of two weeks positively.

That has also not been done.

4 In these circumstances, we are constrained to conclude that the State is not

interested in pursuing these applications. In any event, unless and until the

respondent is served, the entire exercise of examining the applications would be

pointless. Therefore, we are disposing of these applications with liberty to the

State to seek revival of the same, in case they locate the respondent.

5 Both the applications stand disposed of as above.

(Sanjeev Kumar)

(Badar Durrez Ahmed) Chief Justice

Judge

Jammu

30.11.2017

<u>Sanjeev</u>