

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No.1133 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision: 23.02.2016

Hakmuddeen

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Sarfraj Hussain, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr.Maheshinder Singh Sidhu, Addl.A.G. Haryana
Mr.B.S.Tewatia, Advocate for the respondent No.2 to 23

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

The present revision is filed against the order dated 28.3.2014, whereby the prosecution evidence was closed by order.

At the very outset, it is pointed out that since the order was revisable, the revision should have been filed before the learned Sessions Judge. However, since it has been entertained and pending before this Court for the last two years, therefore, this Court proceed to decide the same.

The perusal of file shows that FIR was registered in the year 2009. As per the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner, charges were framed in the year 2010, which shows that the case remained pending for about four years. According to learned counsel

for the respondent, 20 opportunities were given to the prosecution. The impugned order shows that last opportunity was granted on four occasions. Even then the prosecution failed to conclude its evidence.

It being so, there has to be some end to the litigation. Therefore, when after the grant of so many opportunities and the last opportunities, the evidence was not produced, no option was left with the lower Court but to close the prosecution evidence by order.

There is no illegality in the impugned order.

The present revision stands dismissed.

23.02.2016
gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge