

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

PARAMJIT KAUR SAINI
2015.02.24 10:35
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM-M-5971 of 2015

Date of Decision: 23.02.2015

Hans Raj Chaudhary

---Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

---Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: None.

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

REKHA MITTAL, J.

Case called out twice. No one is present on behalf of the petitioner.

Perusal of averments set up in the petition would make it evident that the petitioner has sought to challenge the notice issued by the Judge, Special Court for confiscation of the vehicle in question under Section 60(3) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (in short "the Act"). The petitioner being the registered owner of the vehicle has been provided with an opportunity of being heard by the court concerned in compliance with the provisions of Section 60(3) of the Act. As the Court has initiated proceedings in accordance with law, the petitioner is not entitled to indulgence of this Court in exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C., therefore, the petition is ordered to be dismissed being premature.

**(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE**

23.02.2015

PARAMJIT