

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

CRM-M No.28763 of 2014
Date of Decision.22.09.2017

Nirmal SinghPetitioner

Vs

State of Punjab and anotherRespondents

2. CRM-M No.2912 of 2016

Harvinder SinghPetitioner

Vs

State of Punjab and anotherRespondents

Present: Mr. Bhoop Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Onkar Singh Batalvi, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J.(ORAL)

This order of mine shall dispose of two petitions preferred by Nirmal Singh and Harvinder Singh seeking quashing of the FIR bearing No.12 dated 23.1.2014 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Division No.5 Civil Lines, District Ludhiana on various grounds.

This Court while issuing notice of motion in CrI. Misc. No.2912 of 2016 had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon CRM-M-28763 of 2014 titled 'Nirmal Singh Vs. State of Punjab.'

Notice of motion for 22.4.2016.

To be heard along with CRM-M-28763 of 2014.

However, framing of the charge by learned trial

Court would not affect merits of the case but learned trial Court would send status report.”

It has been brought to the notice of this Court by the State counsel that out of 8 witnesses, one witness was examined on previous date of hearing and on the next date of hearing i.e. 17.10.2017, four witness have to be examined and the prosecution undertakes to examine all witnesses as early as possible.

Mr. Batalvi, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that keeping in view the aforementioned stand of the State, no useful purpose would be served as the charge-sheet in the aforementioned case was served upon the petitioner on 02.07.2015.

In view of the stand taken by the counsel for the State, I dispose of the petitions by fixing time line for the prosecution to conclude the evidence within a period of four months and the judgment shall be pronounced two months thereafter. In any case, if it is found by the trial Court that despite examination-in-chief of the prosecution witnesses, the accused are indulging in delaying the cross-examination then the direction aforementioned would not be adhered to.

Both the crl. petitions are disposed of on the above terms.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

September 22, 2017
Pankaj*

Whether reasoned/speaking Yes

Whether reportable No