

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-17017-2022**

Date of Decision: 10th October, 2023

Gurdeep @ Monty @ Minti

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)

1. Learned State Counsel submits that the petitioner was acquitted in FIR No. 610 dated 18.6.2018 under Sections 148/149/323/324/34/506 IPC, 1860 (later deleted Sections 148 and 149 and added Sections 34 IPC, 1860 and Section 3(1) and Section 3(2)(va) of Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989) registered at P.S. City Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

2. None has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner. Similar was the position on last date also.

3. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the State, petition is disposed of as infructuous.

4. Needless to say that petitioner would be at liberty to revive the prayer in case there is any factual error in statement made by learned State counsel.

5. Since the main case has been disposed of as infructuous, the pending application(s), if any is rendered infructuous.

**(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE**

10th October, 2023

anuradha

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No