

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

CRM-M-22402-2011(O&M)

Date of Decision : 27.01.2015

RAGHUVINDER CHATTLEY @ GHUGI PETITIONER

VS

ARUNA KAPOOR

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. Gautam Dutt , Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Ankit Goel, Advocate for the respondent.

- i. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
- ii. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
- iii. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in another petition filed between the same parties bearing CRM-M No. 32743 of 2013 a direction was issued on 04.10.2013 directing the trial Court to conclude the trial expeditiously and preferably within 4 months but the trial has not been concluded till date and as of now he would be satisfied if he is permitted to withdraw this petition at this stage but the trial Court be directed to conclude the case expeditiously. Learned counsel for the respondent states that the matter is fixed for the evidence of the respondent and he would have no objection if the trial Court is directed to decide the case within 60 days from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order as he would lead his entire

evidence within the aforesaid time frame.

In this view of the matter the prayer of learned counsel for the petitioner is allowed and the petition is dismissed as withdrawn. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for respondent No.2 the trial Court is directed to decide this case finally within 60 days from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Since the main case has been decided, the Criminal Misc.Application, if any also stands disposed of.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

January 27, 2015
sunita