

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc. No.M-12818 of 2013

Date of Decision: 05.05.2016

Suraj Bhan Thakur

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana & another

...Respondent(s)

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. I.S. Saggu, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Manpreet Kaur, Advocate for

Mr. K.S. Kang, Advocate for respondent no.2.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 CrPC is for quashing of FIR No.53 dated 20.3.2012 under Sections 420/467/468/471 IPC registered at Police Station Faridabad N.I.T (Annexure P-1) and chargesheet dated 20.2.2013 (Annexure P-9).

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that as per his instructions, on the basis of the chargesheet pending before the trial Court, no prosecution witness has been examined so far.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that charge has been framed against the petitioner, however, he takes

an objection that the petitioner has not availed his remedy to file a revision petition against framing of charge.

Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner wishes to withdraw the present petition with liberty to challenge the chargesheet dated 20.2.2013(Annexure P-9) before the revisionary Court. However, he submits that since the present petition was filed without availing the aforesaid remedy, there is justification for him to seek condonation of delay.

Dismissed as withdrawn with liberty aforesaid. In case the petitioner files a revision petition against chargesheet dated 20.2.2013 (Annexure P-9) within a period of one month from today, the revisionary Court shall not dismiss the same merely on account of limitation.

May 05, 2016
AK

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE