



286 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-304-2024
Date of Decision: 11.12.2024

VINOD KUMAR AND ANOTHER ... PETITIONERS
VS.
STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER .. RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr.T.P.Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Aashish Bishnoi, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Divyam Singh, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

ANOOP CHITKARA , J.(ORAL)

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
395	06.05.2022	Sadar Karnal, District Karnal	406, 420 and 120-B IPC

1. Seeking quashing of FIR captioned above, the petitioner has come up before this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973.
2. Counsel for respondent No.2 submits that charges have been framed whereas petitioners did not challenge the same. He further submits that once a judicial order has been passed framing the charges, that judicial order must be explicitly challenged which has not been done in the present case.
3. Petitioners' counsel submits that charges have been framed after issuance of notice of motion.
4. Given above, the present petition is not maintainable and the same is disposed of. However, liberty is granted to the petitioners to file fresh petition. It is clarified that filing and disposal of the present petition shall not come in the petitioner's way. It is further clarified that the time for which the present petition remain pending before this Court shall not be counted for the purpose of limitation if fresh petition is filed to challenge the framing of charges. All pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

11.12.2024
smriti

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No