

**CRM-31382-83-2015 in/and
CRR-380-2006 (O&M)**

-1-

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

**CRM-31382-83-2015 in/and
CRR-380-2006 (O&M)**

Date of Decision: September 23, 2015

Rattan Lal

.....Petitioner

Versus

Ganga Ram and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present: Mr.P.R.Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Aman Chaudhary, Advocate
for respondent No.1-applicant.

Mr.Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl.A.G.Haryana.

.....

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)

CRM-31382-2015

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and
going through the contents of the application, respondent No.1-
applicant is exempted from filing the certified copies of the

documents, Annexures A-1(Colly) and A-2.

CRM disposed of.

CRM-31383-2015

Prayer in this application is for placing on record the documents, Annexures A-1 (Colly) and A-2.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the documents, Annexures A-1(Colly) and A-2 are taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

CRM disposed of.

CRR-380-2006

At the very outset, Mr.P.R.Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that on the last date of hearing he had seen the physical condition of respondent No.1-accused; he has also gone through the photographs as well as the medical evidence, Annexures A-1(colly) and A-2 produced on record and the fact that respondent No.1-accused was terminated from the service, he does not press the petition on merits. He further prays that he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition.

Learned counsel for respondent No.1-accused as well as the learned counsel for the State has no objection to the prayer of Mr.P.R.Yadav, representing the petitioner-informant.

After considering the stand of the learned counsel for the parties and perusing the material available on record, this Court also finds substance in the submissions put forward by learned counsel for the petitioner.

The petitioner is permitted to withdraw the present petition.

So ordered.

September 23, 2015
meenu

(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)
JUDGE