

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

CRWP-10002-2022

Date of decision : 18.11.2022

Ankush

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Ravinder Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

Pursuant to the order dated 28.10.2022, report from the Sessions Judge, Kaithal has been received. The same is taken on record. The same reads as under:-

“In compliance to the Hon'ble High Court's letter under reference, it is informed that Ms. Natasha Sharma, Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal, vide letter No. 657 dated 04.11.2022 (copy enclosed), has reported that the subject cited case is pending in her Court at the stage of framing of charge against accused persons and fixed for 02.12.2022; production warrants of petitioner and co-accused have been issued for the aforesaid date. Personal presence of accused Ankush is required for framing of charge. Thereafter, the accused petitioner could face the trial through medium of electronic video-linkage video conferencing from the jail concerned. This is for your honour's kind information and necessary action, as desired.”

2. In view of the above, counsel for the petitioner submits that he will be satisfied if the State is directed to take precautions w.r.t. protection of life of the petitioner on the day he is produced for framing of charge. Mr. Ambavta submits that on the said date, the State shall consider the perception of threat and shall make arrangements accordingly.

3. In the light of report received from the Sessions Judge, Kaithal and the statement made by State counsel, no further order is required to be passed in the present petition. The same is disposed off with the direction to conduct the trial qua the petitioner pending before the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal in FIR No.650 dated 16.11.2021, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 387 and 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act (Sections 506, 120, 120-B of IPC added later on) at Police Station Pundri, District Kaithal through electronic video-linkage/video conferencing from the jail as far as possible and feasible. In case the petitioner is required to be present in person before the Court on any date of hearing during the course of trial, the State shall abide by the statement given by the State counsel as noticed hereinabove.

4. Disposed off accordingly.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

18.11.2022

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No