

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

Crl. Misc. No. M-23245 of 2015

DATE OF DECISION: 18.09.2015

Hari Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**BEFORE:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY**

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

Present:- Mr. Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mrs. Ritu Punj, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**DAYA CHAUDHARY, J.**

While issuing notice of motion on 28.8.2015, it was contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that no PO proceedings have been initiated against the petitioner, whereas, learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that PO proceedings have been initiated against the petitioner and challan qua to other accused has already been filed.

Since, a wrong averment qua initiation of PO proceedings as well as presentation of challan against the petitioner has been made, whereas, as stated by learned State counsel, PO proceedings have already been initiated against the petitioner, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner as he has not only wasted the time of the trial Court but also of the investigating agency.

Petition is dismissed accordingly.

However, in case the petitioner surrenders before the trial Court and moves an application for regular bail, the same be decided within a period of one week from the date of filing of the application as per law.

September 18, 2015  
pooja

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**