

262.

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

CRM-M-19941-2016

Date of decision:03.11.2016

Amit @ Sonu

... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Hemen Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of F.I.R. No.188 dated 14.02.2016 under Sections 3-B, 4, 5, 6, 18, 22, 23, 25 of Pre-Conception and Pre-natal Diagnostic Techniques (Prohibition of Sex Selection) Act, 1994 (for short, PNDT Act) and Sections 420/75 IPC, registered at Police Station Panipat City, District Panipat (Annexure P-1).

It is the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner that under the PNDT Act, no FIR can be registered and the only remedy, if any, available to the authorities to file complaint under the PNDT Act.

Reply of Desh Raj Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, City, Panipat, filed in court on behalf of respondent No.1-State, is taken on record. Para 4 of preliminary submissions of the reply reads as under:-

“That completion of investigation the final report U/s 173 Cr.P.C. was prepared on 23.06.2016 and same has been

presented before the Hon'ble Trial Court and the same has been adjourned to 13.12.2016, for framing of charge. It is very much pertinent to mention here that the complaint has been filed by the appropriate authority on 02.08.2016 and now the next date is 13.12.2016.”

Learned State counsel submits that since the appropriate authority has filed complaint under the PNDT Act on 02.08.2016, present petition no more survives.

Heard, learned counsel for the parties.

In view of the fact that the appropriate authority has already filed the complaint, present petition has become infructuous and disposed of as such.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

03.11.2016
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No.
Yes/No.