

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

CRM-M-24021-2016

Date of decision: July 21, 2016.

Vivek Anand

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Haryana and others

... **Respondents**

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

Present: Shri Nitesh Singhi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Deputy 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):

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner. What is under challenge is the order dated 3.12.2015 (Annexure P-11) declaring the petitioner as a proclaimed offender in Complaint Case No.70/2012 dated 24.5.2012, under Sections 29 of the Insecticides Act, 1968, pending in the court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Karnal. Perused the impugned order.

Notice of motion to the respondent-State. Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner states that the criminal case in which the petitioner is being prosecuted is for an offence under Section 29 of the Insecticides Act, 1968 which is also bailable. He further submits

that though he was absent on a date but then, the petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial court hereinafter with promptitude.

I accept the statement made by learned Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner would now appear before the trial Judge and would not remain absent for facing the trial.

Consequently, the petition is allowed, the impugned order is quashed and set aside. The petitioner to appear before the trial Judge on the next date of hearing by furnishing fresh bail bonds.

In view of the fact that the complaint is under Section 29 of the Insecticides Act, I further direct the trial Judge to conclude the trial within four months from today.

July 21, 2016.
kadyan

[A.B. Chaudhari]
Judge