

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

CRM-M No. 45560 of 2016

DATE OF DECISION :- February 22, 2018

Bhupinder Singh @ Sonu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAN

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

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he be permitted to withdraw the petition. Though he submits that a direction be issued to the trial Court to conclude the trial expeditiously.

Permission is granted. The petition is dismissed as withdrawn. The trial Court is directed to conclude the trial by giving short adjournments preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this order in the Court. The prosecution is directed to ensure the presence of the witnesses summoned for a particular date and should avoid seeking adjournments without any justifiable reason.

It has been brought to my notice that the trial Court has been adjourning the case for the reason that accused lodged in Central Jail, Faridkot was not produced in the Court. The trial Court should have procured the presence of the accused by way of Video Conferencing and

then record the statements of PWs rather than simply adjourning the case sending the PWs unexamined for the reason that accused is not produced in the Court. The trial Court may adopt such practice in future.

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

February 22, 2018
p.singh

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