

234 (1)
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-17729 of 2015 (O/M)
Date of decision : 30.5.2016

Ramesh Chander Sharma Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sudhir Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Girdhar, Additional A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Akash Deep Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 4.

Mr. Mrigank Sharma, Advocate.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper 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 ?
- . - .-. -

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed for quashing the order dated 7.4.2015, passed by respondent No. 4 i.e. OSD to the Chief Minister, Haryana, for re-investigating in case FIR No. 63, dated 11.2.2012, registered under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC read with Section 34 IPC, at Police Station Kundli, District Sonipat. Further direction has been sought that respondents No. 1 to 3 may be directed not to initiate re-investigation since report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented in the Court on 18.1.2014.

The State has filed its reply. On behalf of the State, the learned State counsel has stated that in this case, no re-investigation or further investigation is being conducted and if some steps have been taken,

CRM No. M-17729 of 2015 (O/M)

it will not be relied upon. It is further stated that the challan, in this case, has already been presented in the Court and the trial is going on.

In view of the matter and the undertaking given by the State, the order dated 7.4.2015, passed by respondent No. 4, shall not be given effect to. No re-investigation or further investigation shall be conducted and the trial Court is directed to proceed with the case and decide the same on merits expeditiously.

The present petition is allowed to the abovenoted extent.

The prayer of the learned counsel for the petitioner for imposing exemplary costs upon respondent No. 4 is declined.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

30.5.2016
sjks