

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

**Crl. Misc.-M No.1328 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03.02.2016**

Rakesh Jain

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

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? No

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J.

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for setting aside the order dated 02.01.2016, whereby the application filed under Section 311 Cr.P.C. for examining the controller and the person maintaining the CCTV camera, as additional evidence has been declined.

Heard.

The petitioner had moved an application on 07.10.2015, which was dismissed vide Annexure P-3. The said order was challenged in CRM-M-4195-2015, decided separately today. That revision petition has been dismissed.

The counsel for the petitioner had stated that the provisions of the Evidence Act were not mentioned in the heading of their application moved on 07.10.2015, therefore,

in order to make more clear, they had moved another application Annexure P-4 on 22.12.2015 and the SDJM, Samalkha has dismissed the application on 02.01.2016 and it was necessary to challenge the same as it would stand in their way. The counsel has stated that they had deposited the cost of Rs.5,000/- imposed on 02.01.2016.

The contents of the application Annexure P-4 are similar to the prayer made by them in the earlier petition (CRM-M-4195-2015). That petition has been dismissed. There is no merit in this petition as well. It appears that the effort of the petitioner is only to delay the trial. The case is fixed for final arguments. The trial Court would expedite the trial.

The petition is dismissed.

(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE

03.02.2016

'Sunil'