

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

**CRR No.2921 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : September 20, 2018**

Talib Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Altaf Hussain, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Heard.

There are two applications for condonation of delay in filing the present revision petition. One is for 305 days and the other is for 302 days.

The petitioner has impugned the order dated 31.07.2017 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Mewat, vide which the charges were framed against the petitioner under Sections 148, 149, 323, 452, 307, 302 IPC and 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he was not heard at the time of framing of charge.

However, the impugned order shows that the accused was in custody at that time along with his counsel and was heard. Thereafter, the Court fixed the case for prosecution evidence. It is not denied by the learned counsel for the petitioner that so far as many as 14 witnesses have been examined and at none of the dates, objection was raised that at the time of

framing of

the charge, the petitioner was not heard. Now, when the trial has progressed to a large extent and speaking order was passed while framing the charge against the petitioner, there is no ground to interfere in the order of framing of charge.

As such, the present revision petition is dismissed. There is also no ground to condone the delay.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

September 20, 2018

sarita	
Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No