

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA,
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-23449 of 2014

Decided on : 19.05.2015

Parkash Chand

... Petitioner

Versus

U.T. Chandigarh and others

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr.Amandeep Singh Gill, Assistant Public Prosecutor,
for respondent Nos.1 to 3-U.T.Chandigarh.

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

Hari Pal Verma, J. (Oral)

Previous orders show that none had put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner on 23.09.2014, 08.12.2014 and 24.02.2015. Even today also, no one is present on behalf of the petitioner.

Learned State counsel on instructions from Sub Inspector, Baj Singh submits that the police has visited the given address and found that the petitioner is not residing on that address. Mother-in-law of the petitioner, namely, Satya Devi, is residing at the given address and she has stated that the petitioner is staying in Delhi and she has no idea about his whereabouts.

Considering the fact that no one is appearing on behalf of the petitioner, this Court feels that the petitioner has no cause of action to continue with the present petition.

Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

[Hari Pal Verma]
Judge

19.05.2015

sd