

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

CRM-M No.34552 of 2015.
Decided on:-02.02.2016.

Subhani.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana 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. Mohammad Arshad, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

None for respondents No.5 to 12.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for issuance of a direction to official respondents to conduct a fair and impartial investigation in case FIR No.946 dated 22.7.2015 under Section 365 IPC registered at Police Station Gurgaon City, District Gurgaon on the complaint of the petitioner.

Reply on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4 has been filed. The relevant part of para No.1 of the preliminary submissions of said reply reads as under:

“That the present petition is not maintainable. It is submitted that case FIR No.946 dated 22.07.2015 under Section 365 IPC Police Station City Gurgaon was registered against the

respondents No.5 to 12 on the basis of FIR No.Zero dated 08.07.2015 under Section 365 IPC Police Station Nuh, District Mewat which was lodged on the complaint submitted by petitioner. The investigation of the case is being conducted by ASI Rajinder Kumar, Police Post Pataudi Road, Gurgaon fairly, diligently. The investigating officer made several raids at the home addresses of the accused persons for arresting them but the accused persons did not found at the address. Now the Non Bailable Arrest Warrants of the accused have been got issued by the Investigating Officer for 23.12.2015 on second time as the first Non Bailable Arrest Warrants of the accused were got issued for 18.11.2015.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Rajinder Kumar, informs that the case is fixed for 9.2.2016 for execution of the non-bailable warrant issued against the accused.

The aforesaid reply and the progress as apprised by learned State counsel satisfy the counsel for the petitioner at this stage.

As such, in the light of the reply submitted on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4 and submission made by learned State counsel, no further order is required to be passed and the present petition is disposed of accordingly.

February 02, 2016
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE