

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14125-2017

Date of decision : 01.05.2017

Mufeed

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Saleem Ahmed, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Chopra, DAG, Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Though learned counsel for the State has produced in Court today an answer sheet in respect of an “objective type examination”, as also another answer sheet in which one page is seen to be filled in, learned counsel for the petitioner further points to the fact that though the person allegedly impersonating the petitioner was sought to have been arrested at the spot itself during the day time, the FIR itself was registered on the next day, i.e. 12.03.2017.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Kalyan Singh, submits that as a matter of fact the FIR was registered on the night of 11/12.03.2017 and could not be registered earlier due to a computer failure,

It is to be noticed in this regard that this Court had summoned the DGP, Haryana, in CRWP-1183-2016, in view of the fact that a similar plea was taken by officials of a Police Station in District Jind and the DGP

stations, that in case the computer is not functional for any reason whatsoever, manual entries are to be made.

Hence, keeping in view the aforesaid, but without making any comment on the merits of the case for or against the petitioner, the order dated 26.04.2017 is made absolute, on the same terms and conditions.

The petition is disposed of.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

May 01, 2017.
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No