

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Criminal Revision No.2674 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: August 11, 2015

State of PunjabPetitioner
versus
Manpreet Singh @ Manni Gill and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.BAJANTHRI.

Present: Mr.Vaibhav Sharma, DAG, Punjab,
for the petitioner.
Mr.Pardeep Virk, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

-.-

- 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?

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion to respondent No.1 (Manpreet Singh) only at this stage.

On our asking, Mr.Pardeep Virk, Advocate, accepts notice on his behalf.

In view of the nature of order which we propose to pass there is no need to seek any reply from respondent No.1 or to serve respondent Nos.2 to 4 at this stage.

State of Punjab has laid challenge to the order dated 22.02.2014 passed by Special Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib whereby the application moved by respondent No.1 to supply and/or preserve the call details of certain mobile numbers mentioned in the impugned order, has been allowed and directions to that effect have been issued.

It is pointed out by learned counsel for respondent No.1 that in deference to the above-stated order, some call

details have already been supplied to respondent No.1.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that the first respondent, in the connected cases, has appended some of the call details.

It thus appears that no effective relief can be granted in this revision petition at this stage which, in a way, has been rendered infructuous. The same is accordingly disposed of keeping the question of law open. It goes without saying that as and when the occasion arises to rely-upon the details of call entries supplied and/or preserved, as the case may be, the parties concerned shall be at liberty to raise their respective claims/objections before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

Ordered accordingly.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

August 11, 2015
mohinder

[P.B.BAJANTHRI]
JUDGE

Criminal Misc. No.26617 of 2014 in
Criminal Revision No.2674 of 2014

- - -

State of Punjab versus Manpreet Singh and others

Present : Mr.Vaibhav Sharma, DAG, Punjab,
for the applicant-petitioner.
Mr.Pardeep Virk, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

* * *

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the
same is allowed subject to all just exceptions and 94 days'
delay in filing the revision petition is condoned.

CRM stands disposed of.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

August 11, 2015
mohinder

(P.B.BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE