

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

**CRL. MISC. No.M-30981 OF 2016 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 22nd SEPTEMBER, 2016**

Kamal Narang

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

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

* * * *

Present : Mr. Naresh Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

* * * *

A. B. CHAUDHARI, J. (ORAL)

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length.

Perused the impugned order.

This is a petition filed by the proposed accused who feels that he would be accused in the crime in question. Learned counsel for the petitioner on behalf of the petitioner made a grievance that in the FIR in question four times cancellation report has been filed by the Police. According to him despite this position the trial Court has directed the Police/Investigating Officer to carryout further investigation. According to him the trial Court is thus compelling the Police to file a challan. He cited the decision in the case of *Abhinandan Jha & others Versus Dinesh Mishra, 1968 AIR (SC)117* and submitted that trial court does not have jurisdiction to compel the Police to file the challan.

In my opinion, the petitioner who feels that he would be proposed accused has apprehension and in anticipation filed this petition against the Magistrate, who made the orders from time to time to further investigate the case. The law is well settled that during investigation or

during the proceedings before the Magistrate or the trial Court, the accused person does not have any locus standi to challenge any order or interact or interfere with the investigation. The petition is therefore, dismissed for want of locus standi.

22nd SEPTEMBER, 2016
'raj'

(A. B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	No
Whether Reportable:	Yes	No.