

CRM-M-20006-2020

Date of Decision: 22.01.2021

Gurbachan Singh @ Guru

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Gurpal Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, DAG, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard by video conferencing.

On 13.01.2021, the following order had been passed:-

Case heard by video conferencing. On December 04, 2020, the following order had been passed:- All cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

On 17.11.2020, the following order had been passed:-

“All the cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

The petitioner was admitted to interim bail on the ground that the FSL report had not been received, with learned State counsel today submitting that in fact the said report has been received, showing that a total of 1229 grams of 'tramadol hydrochloride' were recovered from the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner however wishes to place on record photographs etc. showing that the petitioner was actually not arrested in the manner shown in the FIR and consequently the entire recovery has been planted upon him (as contended).

Adjourned to 04.12.2020.

In the meanwhile, whatever photographs etc. the petitioner wishes to place on record, he will positively do the needful by way of an appropriate application, failing which the interim order will stand vacated on the next date of hearing itself. Till then the interim order would continue to operate.”

Even till today, no photographs in terms of what was contended by learned counsel for the petitioner on the last date have been placed on record.

Adjourned to 18.12.2020, with it made clear that if an appropriate application is not filed, with an advance copy thereof to the State, placing on record any such material that the petitioner wishes to reply upon, the interim order would be liable to be vacated.

Interim order to continue till that date only.”

Today learned counsel for the petitioner who has some problem in his connection, conveyed to the Reader of this court, as also to the coordinator of the video conference, that the petitioner does not want to pursue this petition.

However, since there is no application for that purpose on record, with the interim order passed

*on 10.08.2020 standing vacated with effect from today,
adjourned to 22.01.2021.*

Today, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the
petitioner does not wish to pursue this petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

January 22, 2021
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
No.