

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

CRM-M-4067-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: February 28, 2017.

Central Bureau of Investigation

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Haryana and others

... **Respondents**

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI**

Present: Shri Sumeet Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri Arjun Singh Yadav, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.
Shri Pardeep Kumar Rapria, Advocate for respondents 2 to 5.
Shri Sarfraj Hussain, Advocate for applicant-complainant.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral):

Counsel for the respondent-State of Haryana makes a categorical statement that they have no objection to the transfer of the case to CBI Court at Panchkula in view of the fact that there is already a notification issued by the State of Haryana.

CRM No.6627 of 2017 is allowed and the complainant is impleaded as a respondent.

Learned Counsel for the respondents No.2 to 5 (accused) objects to the transfer of the case to the CBI Court at Panchkula on the ground that there are several other circumstances which should be considered by this Court. In my opinion, since there is already a notification issued by the competent authority and in particular the constitution of the CBI Court at Panchkula and there being existing a notification issued by the State Govt., this Court has no power to refuse transfer of the case to the CBI Court at Panchkula. Objection raised by the counsel for the respondent-accused is rejected.

Petition is accordingly allowed and the rule is made absolute in terms of the prayer clause.

February 28, 2017.
kadyan

[**A.B. Chaudhari**]
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No