

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

CRM-M-33976 of 2014 (O&M)
Decided on:-17.05.2016.

Santa Singh and others

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Mr. Atul Lakhanpal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Jasmeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sultan Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. M.K. Singla, Advocate
for the applicant-respondent No.3.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

CRM-33094-2015

This is an application for impleading applicant Pritam Singh as
respondent No.3.

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed
and applicant Pritam Singh is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.3.

Amended Memo of Parties is taken on record.

Main Case

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.PC is for

quashing of Calendra under Section 145 Cr.PC (Annexure P-5) initiated on the basis of Rapat No.17 dated 2.9.2014 Police Station, Moonak, District Sangrur.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that the said Calendra was filed in the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Moonak, District Sangrur. Since the matter in issue has been adjudicated by way of civil court decree, the Calendra is liable to be quashed. He further submits that even the plea of counter-claim was rejected by the civil Court. In support of his assertion, learned senior counsel has produced certified copy of judgment dated 30.1.2016 passed by the Court of Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Moonak in civil suit No.218 of 27.8.2014 titled as "Santa Singh Versus Binder Singh and another". The same is taken on record.

Learned counsel for newly added respondent No.3 does not dispute the civil court decree and submits that in view of development taken place after filing of the Calendra, the present petition no more survives.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Since the matter in dispute has already been adjudicated by the civil Court by way of judgment dated 30.1.2016, quashing of Calendra under Section 145 Cr.PC no more survives and the present petition is disposed of as such.

May 17, 2016
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE