

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

(Sr. No.245)

CRM-M-45084-2016

Date of Decision:-March 16, 2017

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

.....Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS

.....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Sumeet Goel, Advocate for the petitioner-CBI.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl.AG Haryana with
Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Surinder Pal, Advocate for respondents No.3, 25, 39, 31 &
41.

Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate for respondents No.7 and 10.

Mr. Rakesh Deswal, Advocate for respondent No.13.

Mr. Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate for respondents No.4, 5, 6,
14, 21, 26, 31 and 33.

Mr. Chirag Kundu, Advocate for respondent No.28.

Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate for respondent No.30.

Mr. Anshuman Dalal, Advocate for respondent No. 37.

Mr. Ramesh Malik, Advocate for respondent No.40.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral)

This is petition is filed by the CBI, Chandigarh with the
following prayer:

“Transfer of trial and other miscellaneous matters
pertaining to FIR No. 118 dated 27.02.2016, under Section
148/149/186/188/307/353/395/427/436/452/120-B IPC, Section
25/54/59 Arms Act, and Sections 3 and 4 of Prevention of

Damage to Public Property Act, PS Urban Estate, Rohtak (now CBI Case RCCHH512016S0014 dated 6.10.2016, CBI, SCB, Chandigarh) from the court of Ld. Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak and Ld. Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak to Ld. Special Court, CBI at Panchkula.”

Learned counsel for the State submits that he has no objection if the above prayer is allowed.

In that view of the matter, the petition is allowed in terms of the prayer made hereinabove, the rule is made absolute subject to the decision of Civil Writ Petition No. 3802 of 2017.

March 16, 2017

Rajeev

(A.B. Chaudhari)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No