

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No.3115 of 2015 (O&M).
Decided on:-August 24, 2015.

Sushma and othersPetitioners.
Versus

State of Punjab.Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

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. Prashant Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have approached this Court challenging the order dated 6.8.2015 whereby the trial Court i.e. the Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala has framed charges against the petitioners in FIR No.98 dated 7.11.2014 for the offence under sections 302, 323, 148, 149 IPC, registered at Police Station, Ghanaur, District Patiala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that bare perusal of the contents of the FIR shows that there is no injury attributed to the petitioners and the complainant has tried to drag every possible member of the family in the crime. The petitioner No.2 is the wife of accused Balak Ram whereas petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 are the wives of other brothers of said Balak Ram, who allegedly have come on spot with dangs and sticks and started giving beatings to the complainant.

The contention of the counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have not given any injury to the complainant, is a subject matter of trial and the trial Court will look into such like aspects.

However, in view of the fact that the charges have been framed against the accused by the trial Court, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he does not press the present petition further but prays that let the trial court be directed to dispense with the personal appearance of the petitioners during the trial.

I have considered the aforesaid submissions and found that though the charges have been framed against the petitioners-accused, but the trial court is yet to establish the involvement of the petitioners in the crime.

However, considering the fact that no serious injury has been attributed to the petitioners, the trial Court is directed to dispense with the personal appearance of the petitioners during the trial unless it is otherwise necessarily required.

It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as reflection of any opinion on the merits of the main case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of availability of evidence without being influenced in any manner.

Disposed of.

August 24, 2015
'Yag Dutt'

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE