

130

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-8685 of 2016 (O/M)
Date of decision : 14.3.2016

Ranjit Singh and another Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Nitesh Singhi, Advocate, for the petitioners.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?
- .- -.-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in this case, at the stage of defence evidence, the prosecution had filed an application under Section 91 Cr.P.C. for permission to produce some documents and the same was allowed. But, the documents were not produced and vide order dated 19.1.2016 (Annexure-P-5), passed by the Id. Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana, the case was adjourned to 28.1.2016 for defence evidence. However, on the next date, i.e. 28.1.2016, the documents were allowed to be produced.

Heard.

The perusal of order dated 19.1.2016 (Annexure-P-5), the Id. Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana, shows that though it was observed that there is no justification for granting more

CRM No. M-8685 of 2016 (O/M)

opportunity to the prosecution to produce the documents, but the defence evidence was not closed by orders. Therefore, on the next date, the Id. Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana, allowed the production of documents. There is nothing illegal in the same. Hence, the present petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

14.3.2016
sjks