

*** IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of Order: 30th August, 2010

+ WP (Crl.) No. 651 of 2010 & Crl. M.A. No. 440/2008

%

30.08.2010

BANGARU LAXMAN

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manish Mohan and
Mr. Atul Kr. Advocates

Versus

STATE (THROUGH CBI)

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Harish Gulati, Advocate for CBI

JUSTICE SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporter or not?
3. Whether judgment should be reported in Digest?

(ORAL)

1. By this petition, the petitioner has assailed an order dated 26th July, 2006, of learned Special Judge taking cognizance of the offence. The order of taking cognizance of the offence under Prevention of Corruption Act is purely an interlocutory order. Since for the offence under Prevention of Corruption Act, the trial procedure to be followed by the Special Judge is akin to warrant trial procedure, no detailed reasoned order was required for taking cognizance. There is no infirmity in the order.

2. I find that this petition, assailing a purely interlocutory order of taking cognizance of offences, is a gross misuse of judicial process and the petition is liable to be dismissed. It is dismissed accordingly.

August 30, 2010
acm

SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA, J.