

293

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-24581-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : 19.03.2024

TEJPAL NUNIA AND ORSPetitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANRRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. R.K. Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. R.S. Bains, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Arushi Garg, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 407 read with
Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking transfer of different FIRs registered against the
petitioner before a single Court at Charkhi Dadri.

2. The petitioner has been booked in different FIRs at different
places. The details of which are as hereunder:

- i) FIR No.321 dated 28.07.2016 registered at Police Station Model
Town Rewari.
- ii) FIR No.123 dated 05.02.2014 registered at Police Station Sirsa.
- iii) FIR No.517 dated 17.08.2014 registered at Police Station Bhiwani.
- iv) FIR No.541 dated 19.06.2014 registered at Police Station Hisar.

v) FIR No.359 dated 17.09.2015 registered at Police Station Rewari City.

3. Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners No.1 and 2 have unfortunately expired during the pendency of the present petition. As such the present petition would survive qua petitioner No.3 only.

4. The petitioner is stated to be running a chit fund/educational loan business. The petitioner is before this Court seeking transfer of the trials to a single Court at Charkhi Dadri.

5. The prayer is being opposed by the Senior Counsel representing the complainant who submits that though the *modus operandi* was same but the FIRs pertain to different transactions and it will be highly inconvenient for the complainants to travel all the way to Charkhi Dadri and it will be rather punishing them for being the complainants.

6. During the course of hearing counsel for the petitioner proposed that the petitioner be allowed to appear before the different Courts during the course of trial through Video Conferencing.

7. Counsel for the complainant has not opposed the said proposal.

8. In view thereof, the petitioner is granted liberty to move appropriate applications before the concerned Trial Courts seeking permission to appear through Video Conferencing.

9. The said applications shall be considered in accordance with law in the background of the fact that the petitioner is facing number of trials. The petitioner may be granted permission to appear through Video

Conferencing subject to the modalities that will be determined by the Trial Courts.

10. However, for the date the Trial Courts feel that the presence of the petitioner is necessary they will be within their right to enforce his physical presence.

11. The present petition is disposed off accordingly.

March 19, 2024		(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr		Judge
	Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
	Whether reportable	: Yes/No