

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-35760 of 2014
Date of decision: 08.01.2015.**

Rajinder Singh @ Raja

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 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?**

Present: Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ritu Punj, Addl. AG, Punjab
for the respondent – State.

Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate
for the complainant.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

The argument of learned counsel for the petitioner is that earlier the petitioner was released on bail by the Police as bailable offence was there and subsequently, Section 326 IPC was added on the basis of injury caused to Gurdita Singh.

Learned State counsel on instructions from HC Paramjit Singh submits that recovery has been effected and the petitioner has joined investigation in view of directions issued by this Court on 17.10.2014.

Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the anticipatory bail to the petitioner keeping in view the seriousness of the offence. Learned counsel for the complainant has also relied upon judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Nassiruddin vs. State (NCT) Delhi and others, 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 98** whereas learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon judgment of this Court in **Rakesh vs. State of Haryana, 2011(2) RCR (Criminal) 436** wherein judgment of Hon'ble the Apex Court in **Prahlad Singh Batti vs. NCT, Delhi and another, 2001(2) RCR (Criminal) 377** has been relied upon.

Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by decision of **Rakesh's case (supra)** as in said case also initially the offence was under Section 324 IPC and subsequently, Section 326 IPC was added.

After hearing arguments of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has joined investigation in compliance of directions issued by this Court and the recovery has also been effected; and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner, the interim directions issued by this Court on 17.10.2014 is made absolute.

Petition is disposed of accordingly.

08.01.2015
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE