

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

101

**CWP-22241-2019 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 14.10.2022.**

Arjun Bhanot.

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Mr. K.S.Khehar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Arun Abrol, Advocate, for
Mr. Parminder Singh – I, Advocate,
for respondent No.3.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

CM-16771-CWP-2019

The instant application has been filed under Order 1 Rule 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, for impleading applicant-complainant Saran Dass Garg son of Sh. Nohar Chand as respondent No.3 being necessary party.

Notice in the present application was issued on 08.11.2019 and the learned counsel for the petitioner had accepted notice, however, even though a period of about 03 years elapsed, no reply to the application has been filed.

In view of above, it appears that the petitioner has no objection if the present application is accepted. Accordingly, the present application is

allowed. Saran Dass Garg son of Sh. Nohar Chand is impleaded as respondent No.3.

Main Case

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance appropriate writ for quashing the impugned investigation report No.374/5A dated 10.10.2017. A further prayer has been made to transfer the investigation to any other Zone or to be conducted by the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI).

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State of Punjab has pointed out that petitioner had earlier filed petitions i.e. CRM-M-56142-2018, titled as “Arjun Bhanot Vs. State of Punjab and another” and CRM-M-22618-2019, titled as “Rakesh Bhanot Vs. State of Punjab” whereby vide judgment dated 27.08.2021, the investigation of the case has been ordered to be transferred to the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) by this Court exercising inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

In view of the aforesaid, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner does not press the instant petition, at this stage.

Dismissed as not pressed, at this stage.

However, liberty is extended to the petitioner to seek revival in case the grievance espoused by the petitioner in the present petition still survives.

October 14, 2022.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No