

Petitioner Vs. Respondent

Petitioner Vs. Respondent

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1186558

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Dec-07-2016

Judge : M. Venugopal

Appeal No. : Crl.M.P.No. 13037 of 2016 In Crl.A.Sr.No. 51128 of 2016

Appellant : Petitioner

Respondent : Respondent

Judgement :

Venugopal, J.

1. Heard Mr.K.Murugesan, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner/ Appellant and Mr.R.Ravichandran, Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) for the Respondent.

2.The Petitioner/Appellant/Accused has filed the present Criminal Appeal in Sr.No.51128 of 2016 as against the Judgment dated 21.09.2016 in Spl.S.C.No.03/2016 passed by the Learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Perambalur.

3. The reasons attributed on behalf of the Petitioner/Appellant/ Accused for the delay of 11 days in preferring the present Appeal is due to the fact that he took some time to secure the lower Court's Judgment from the trial Court's Learned

Counsel and also because of the 'Poverty'.

4. Considering the fact that the Petitioner/Appellant has assigned the reason of 'Poverty' and also he took some time to obtain the Judgment of the trial Court from his lower Court Learned Counsel, this Court, by taking a lenient and liberal view and avoiding a pedantic approach and also hyper technical or technical approach, in the interest of Justice, condones the delay of 11 days in filing the Crl.A.No.51128 of 2016, subject to the condition that the Petitioner/Appellant/Accused shall pay a sum of Rs.125/- (Rupees One Hundred and Twenty Five Only) as costs to the Tamil Nadu Mediation and Conciliation Centre, High Court, Madras, on or before 23.12.2016, failing which, it is made clear that the Petition shall stand dismissed automatically without any further reference to this Court.

5. In fine, the Crl.M.P.No.13037 of 2016 is ordered, in above terms.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com