

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

CRM No.M-26906 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: March 02, 2016.

Randhir Singh

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Haryana and others

... **Respondents**

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

Present: Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Sidhu, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Goyat, Advocate for respondent No.6.

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?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral):

Impugned in the present revision is the order dated 7.6.2014 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners is two-fold. Firstly, cognizance of offence under Section 506 IPC could not be taken as the same is time barred. It comes out that the matter has been remitted by the learned Additional Sessions Judge to the trial court, therefore, the petitioner is at liberty to raise such a plea before the trial court.

Secondly, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar has made certain observations which may prejudice the case of the petitioner while considering the question of framing of charge. Learned counsel contends that pending the present petition, charges have been framed by the trial court. It being so, the trial court is directed to re-hear the parties on the question of charges and pass a fresh order on the merits of the case after considering the material on record without being influenced by the observations made by learned Additional Sessions judge, Hisar.

The petition is disposed of.

March 02, 2016.
kadyan

[Kuldip Singh]
Judge