

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-30998-2015

Date of Decision: February 17, 2016

Avtar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present: Mr. K.S. Dadwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Randhawa, Additional AG, Punjab,
for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Gautam Kaile, Advocate, for
Mr. Anandeshwar Gautam, Advocate,
for respondent No. 2.

.....

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?*

NARESH KUMAR SANGHI, J (Oral)

On 18.12.2015, the following order was passed

“Despite availing sufficient opportunities, reply has not been filed.

Post for final disposal on 15.01.2016.

*Reply, if any, be filed in the meantime,
which shall be subject to the costs of Rs.*

5,000/-, to be deposited in State Legal Services Authority, Punjab.”

Mr. Gautam Kaile, Advocate, learned proxy counsel has appeared for respondent No.2, but failed to answer as to whether the order dated 18.12.2015, has been complied with.

The office report reveals that no reply has been filed by respondent No. 2. Even the receipt for complying with the order of costs has not been placed on record.

In view of the above, it is presumed that respondent No. 2 did not propose to file the reply and deposit the costs imposed by this Court, vide order dated 18.12.2015.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he will be satisfied, if the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Legal Services Authority, Amritsar, is directed to provide legal assistance to the petitioner during the trial of the case titled **State v. Har Parkash Singh**, under Section 182, IPC, pending for adjudication before Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Baba Bakala Sahib.

Learned counsel for the State as well as learned proxy counsel for respondent No. 2, has no objection to the above prayer.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, it is

directed that learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Legal Services Authority, Amritsar, would provide an efficient lawyer to the petitioner to defend/pursue the above stated case before learned Trial Court. The costs imposed upon respondent No. 2, be recovered as per norms.

Disposed of accordingly.

(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)
JUDGE

February 17, 2016
apurva