

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-9406-2017

Date of decision : 30.03.2017

Sanjay

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl.A.G.Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from the Excise and Taxation Officer present in Court, submits that firstly the petitioner is not being prosecuted under the provisions of the Haryana Value Added Tax Act, 2003, but for offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC as the petitioners' firm is not a dealer in Haryana but in Rajasthan. The co-accused, who is a dealer in Haryana, whose anticipatory bail petition was dismissed by both this Court and subsequently the Supreme Court is already absconding.

The investigation is also still stated to be at a nascent stage; with the challan not having been presented so far.

In view of the aforesaid, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not press the petition, at this stage.

Dismissed as withdrawn, at this stage.

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

March 30, 2017.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No