

News

Supreme Court inquiries The P&H High Court orders an investigation into the backdated order for the publication order's delay.



The Supreme Court pointed out that it took the top court's involvement before an anticipatory bail ruling dated July 31 could be posted on the High Court website.

The Supreme Court has ordered an investigation into the Punjab and Haryana High Court's anticipatory bail judgment's delayed uploading, determining that although the ruling was dated July 31, it seemed to have been passed and posted just weeks later.

An appeal filed on August 16 was being heard by a bench of Justices JK Maheshwari and Vijay Bishnoi.

The High Court judge's name was not revealed by the Supreme Court.

The petitioner claimed that the High Court's ruling dismissing his request for anticipatory bail had not been uploaded, thus on August 20, the bench requested a report from the High Court's Registrar General.

In response, a report was filed revealing that the order was not accessible on the High Court website until the Supreme Court stepped in.

It's interesting to note that the Registrar General only asked the secretary of the High Court judge in question for an explanation on August 22 and filed a report three days later. At that point, the order had been uploaded, and the judge's medical treatment was cited as the reason for the delay.

The bench pointed out that it was unclear from the explanation when the order was finalized and typed. It noted that, contrary to what the High Court website indicated, the facts indicated the ruling was not genuinely passed on July 31.

The highest court stated, **"It seems that the order in question was not issued on July 31, 2025; rather, it was issued subsequent to this Court's order."**

The Court ordered the stenographer's book and records from the National Informatics Centre (NIC) to be seized in order to confirm the chronology and determine the time the order was typed and posted.

The date the order was typed and updated on the PC was determined by seizing the Secretary's steno book. The bench ordered that a confidential investigation be conducted, that the P.C. report from NIC be gathered about typing and uploading, and that the information be filed on affidavit.

The Court ordered that no coercive measures be taken against the petitioner in the case and granted him temporary protection while sending notice to the State of Haryana.

After four weeks, the case will be heard once more.

Senior Advocate Siddharth Agarwal, together with attorneys **Ankit Sibbal**, **Rohitt Kumar Yadav**, and Ashish Batra, represented the petitioner.

Attorneys **Nipun Katyal**, **Suchakshu** Jain, **Madhakant** Bhatia, Dhananjay Kumar, Surya Pratap Singh Rana, Manan Sharma, Rahul Sachdeva, and Shashank Shekhar represented the complainant.

Advocates Rahul Gupta and Kabir Hathi represented the Punjab and Haryana High Court.

Lawread