

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2229-2016

Date of decision: July 14, 2016.

Pardeep Kumar

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Haryana

... **Respondent**

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

Present: Shri Arpandeep Narula, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

1. *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *Whether to be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral):

Reply filed in Court is taken on record.

Heard learned Counsel for the rival parties and perused the interim order passed by this Court on 1.3.2016. The sale deed is stated to have been executed in the year 2008 and the present petitioner is alleged to have acted as an attesting witness in 2008 on that sale deed. The allegation is that there was impersonation. The complaint made by the complainant is that she paid the price but till date did not receive the possession and then having come to know about the impersonation, complained to the police.

Undoubtedly, the incident is stated to have taken place in 2008 and the FIR is stated to have been lodged in 2014. At any rate, even if the prosecution case is true, the role of the petitioner is that of an attesting

witness. I therefore think that the interim order should be made absolute.

In this view of the matter, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 22.1.2016 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to remain on bail till the conclusion of the trial.

Petition disposed of.

[A.B. Chaudhari]
Judge

July 14, 2016.
kadyan