

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

CRM No.M-511 of 2016

Date of decision: March 31, 2016.

Rakesh Kumar

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Punjab and others

... **Respondents**

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

Present: Mr. Raman Goklaney, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Sanghi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

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):

Report of Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Abohar received that due to rush of work as well as on account of non addressing of arguments either by defence counsel or by the APP for the State, the delay in disposal of the application has occurred. I am of the view that this ground of rush of work as well as non addressing of arguments by the counsel for the parties, is no ground to prolong the disposal of the application and commitment of the case to Sessions Court. The learned Magistrate is advised to be more considerate in future.

Since the case has now been committed to the Sessions Court, learned counsel for the petitioner states that this petition has become infructuous. The same is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn.

March 31, 2016.
kadyan

[**Kuldip Singh**]
Judge