

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

CRR No.906 of 2015.
Decided on:-21.04.2016.

Rashid Mohd.

.....Petitioner.

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. S.P.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurinderjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.S. Dhindsa, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 6.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.

The petitioner has filed the present petition impugning order dated 19.1.2015 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana whereby the application filed by the accused for remanding the case to the trial Court, was allowed and the file was ordered to be sent back to the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ludhiana for either tying the same himself or to entrust the same to some other court of competent jurisdiction.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that as per medico-legal report of injured Ramzan Mohd., he has the history of loss of vision of left eye with some sharp-edged weapon and, therefore, the case of the petitioner falls within the parameters of Section 326 IPC.

Learned counsel for the parties have jointly submitted that they have no objection if the case is remanded back to the Magistrate as ordered by learned Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide order dated 19.1.2015. However, they have further submitted that the Magistrate should pass a fresh order only by examining the doctor.

In view of the above categorical stand of the parties, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to learned Magistrate to pass a fresh order, of course, after examining the doctor concerned.

April 21, 2016
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE