

**133+203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-7671-2021 in/and
CRM-M-1112-2021
Date of Decision: 15.03.2021**

**Ishwar SinghPetitioner
Vs.
State of Haryana and anotherRespondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Kanhiya Soni, Advocate, for the applicant-petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Poswal, A.A.G., Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard via video conferencing.

CRM-7671-2021

Vide the accompanying petition, the applicant-petitioner seeks quashing of FIR no. 305, dated 24.11.2020, registered at Police Station Nangal Chaudhri, District Mahendergarh, for the alleged commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Sections 420/120-B of the IPC and Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914, as also all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

On 11.01.2021, the following order had been passed by this court:-

“Case heard by video conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the letter dated 15.12.2020 (Annexure P-4) issued by Deputy Excise and Taxation Commissioner (Excise), Narnaul (for short 'DETC'), virtually seems to state to the effect that the bottles of liquor seized from the petitioner's vend were actually not required to be batch marked etc.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Surender Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on the asking of the

Court.

Adjourned to 15.03.2021.

Other than the reply of a Gazetted Officer from the police, the DETC concerned is also directed to file an affidavit stating therein as to why, in view of what has been stated in the letter dated 15.12.2020 (referred to above), the FIR was got registered in the first instance by the Inspector (Excise). Meanwhile, in the facts and circumstances, till the next date of hearing, further proceedings in the FIR shall remain stayed.”

Today, this application has been filed, seeking to withdraw the accompanying petition itself.

Notice in the application.

On the asking of the court, Mr. Neeraj Poswal, A.A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Naturally, he does not oppose the application which is consequently allowed.

CRM-M-1112-2021

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Obviously, this court has not made any comment on the merits of the case and even the contention recorded in the aforesaid order was only as per what had been argued by counsel for the petitioner, with it not to be taken as a comment of this court on the correctness of that contention, or otherwise.

March 15, 2021
nitin

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes
No.