

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

CRM-M-3354-2015

Date of Decision: 2.2.2015

Dharambir Singh Budania and another

....Petitioners

vs.

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Ms. Apoorv Sangwan, Advocate
 for Mr. Sidharth Dahiya, Advocate
 for the petitioners.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
- 3. Whether the judgement should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Challenged in the present petition is order dated 7.1.2015 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Hisar (wrongly mentioned as learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Hisar) vide which the application for recalling of Meena Kumari PW-1 and Lalita PW-2 for further cross-examination was declined.

I have gone through the impugned order. In the application it was stated that some material questions regarding causing of injuries on the person of Meena Kumari as well as regarding place of occurrence could not be put to the witnesses.

A perusal of order shows that the witnesses were examined and cross-examined at length. In the case falling under first part of Section 311 Cr.P.C., the Court has got the discretion. Learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Hisar after going through the file has found that recalling

of the witnesses could not be allowed to make fishy inquiries. Sufficient opportunity was given to the learned counsel to examine and cross-examine the witnesses. I do not find any illegality in the impugned order.

Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

2.2.2015
Ishant