

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 9792 of 2017

Date of decision : April 20, 2017

Kamal Kishore

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sharad Kumar Yadav, DAG., Haryana.

Mr. Nitin Kumar, Advocate
for the complainant (Railway Panel)

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J (ORAL).

Pursuant to the order dated 24.2.2017, Mr. Nitin Kumar, learned counsel for the complainant, i.e. Indian Railway, has produced in Court today a statement stated to have been made by the co-accused of the petitioner, wherein it has been stated that all the goods stolen by the person making the statement, i.e. Ram Naresh and his co-accused, were sold to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner on the other hand, submits that petitioner is a bona fide purchaser of the goods and has been simply roped in on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused.

No doubt, the statement is that of a co-accused, but since the petitioner is alleged to be a person who actually purchase all the stolen goods, including the consignment in question that was stolen from the train

itself (Chetak Express), I do not think it is a fit case where the interim order should be allowed to continue.

Consequently, this petition is dismissed and the interim order dated 23.3.2017 is hereby vacated.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

April 20, 2017
archana

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No