4027-9
11.12.24

Soft copy to all Judicial officers, System officer, President Bar Association, Dhanbad

(J. H. C. Sch. 1-7)

Email/Speed Post

Pdf
09-12-24

Dilip Kumar Verma,
Assistant Registrar-X
High Court of Jharkhand,
Dhurwa, Ranchi

Mob: 9123410027
Fax No.: 0651-2481116

Letter No. 4294-C to 4317-C
Dated, Ranchi 07-12-24

To,
All the Principal District & Sessions Judges of the State
Including the Judicial Commissioner, Ranchi.

Sub: Regarding compliance order dated 08.11.2024 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No. 15424 of 2024 titled as "*Patteeswaran Vs. State Rep. By the Inspector of Police.*"

Sir/ Madam,

With reference to above mentioned subject, I am directed to forward herewith a copy of a certified copy of the Order dated 08.11.2024 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No. 15424/2024 with a request to circulate to all the judicial officers as also to the District and Subordinate Bar Associations in your jurisdiction for information and needful.

Encl: as above

Yours faithfully,

07/12/24

Assistant Registrar -X

ITEM NO.41 COURT NO.3 SECTION II-C

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

SR-15424/24

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRIMINAL) Diary No(s). 48856/2024

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 18-06-2024 in CRLOP No. 14019/2024 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras)

PATTEESWARAN Petitioner(s)

VERSUS 24100053

STATE REP BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE Respondent(s)

(IA No.250740/2024-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.250741/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 08-11-2024 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.R. GAVAI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN

Certified to be true copy
Assistant Registrar (Judl.)
22/11/2024
Supreme Court of India

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Pranab Prakash, AOR

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. Since no order prejudicial to the interest of the respondent is being passed, the requirement of issuance of notice to the respondent is waived.

2. Though we do not find any error with the impugned order passed by the High Court as well as the Trial Court, in order to sub-serve the ends of justice, we direct that one more opportunity be granted to the parties so as to enable the petitioner to cross examine the witnesses.

3. It is commonly known that such strategies are being adopted by

some of the defence lawyers. One of us participated in a Conference of Judicial Officers and this difficulty was brought to the notice by the learned Trial Judges.

4. We, therefore, find it appropriate that in an event the witnesses are present and the defence counsel unnecessarily seeks an adjournment, learned Trial Judge should appoint an Amicus and direct the cross examination to proceed.

5. In the present case, we direct the learned Trial Judge to give one more opportunity to the petitioner herein to cross examine the witnesses.

6. It is made clear that on the date to be fixed the petitioner shall cross examine the said witnesses. If again adjournment is sought on the said date, the learned Judge would not grant the same and proceed in accordance with law.

7. With these observations and directions, the special leave petition is disposed of.

8. The Registrar concerned is directed to forward a copy of this order to the Registrar General of all the High Courts for taking appropriate steps.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

8/11/04

(NARENDRA PRASAD)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

08/11/04

(ANJU KAPOOR)
COURT MASTER

8/11