

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT

CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20626-2015

Date of Decision: October 8, 2015

Purshotam Dutt Joshi

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present: Mr. B.S. Makar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl. AG, Haryana,
for respondent Nos. 2, 6 and 7.

Mr. Sumeet Goel, Advocate,
for respondent No. 3/CBI

Mr. Rajneesh Malhotra, Advocate,
for respondent No. 5.

Mr. A.M. Punchhi, Advocate,
for Mr. Anupam Bansal, Advocate,
for respondent Nos. 8 to 11.

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, Advocate,
for respondent No. 13.

Mr. Shrey Goel, Advocate,
for respondent No. 14.

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

NARESH KUMAR SANGHI, J. (Oral)

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, has produced short reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 2, 6 and 7, by way of an affidavit of the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Headquarter, Panchkula,, which is taken on record. He further submits that the main prayer of the petitioner has been accepted, inasmuch as, FIR No. 340, dated 12.9.2015, for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471, IPC, has been registered at Police Station, Sector 5, Panchkula. Thus, the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

In view of above, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press this petition at this stage.

Ordered accordingly.

October 8, 2015
Pkapoor

(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)
JUDGE