

245

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

CRM-M-196 of 2015

Date of decision: July 22, 2016

Maninder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Addl. AG Punjab.

Mr. A.S. Virk, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

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?

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Learned State counsel makes a statement that the prosecution has written to S.P., Panipat for taking appropriate action and therefore, respondent-SHO, Ferozepur is not concerned and could not act against the petitioner.

Keeping in view that *ex parte* order made under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1966 by the District Judge and thus, proceedings are pending before the competent Court, this petition is disposed of, reserving liberty in favour of the petitioner to approach the District Judge, if so advised in the pending proceedings under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1966.

**(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE**

July 22, 2016

mahavir