

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.02.13 12:29
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM No. A-1620-MA of 2014 (O/M)

Date of decision : 10.2.2015

Gram Panchayat of Village Dheypur, District Jalandhar through its
Sarpanch Ms. Dalbir Kaur Applicant

Versus

The Editor, Punjab Kesri and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Rajiv Joshi, Advocate, for the applicant.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?
- .- -.-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Applicant seeks grant of leave to appeal against the judgment dated 14.7.2014, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jalandhar (in short 'learned Magistrate'), vide which the complaint filed by the applicant-Gram Panchayat under Sections 500, 501, 502 read with Section 109 IPC against the respondents was dismissed.

It is stated that the respondents published a defamatory news item in Punjab Kesri on 6.5.2005, which is reproduced as under :-

“Adampur Ke Gaon Dheypur Main Kanun Ka Ura Mazak”

It is submitted that the said news item reads as, with the alleged support of District Administration, the Gram Panchayat was constructing Panchayat Ghar upon a

Shamlat land with the help of police by ignoring the Court's orders. It is further submitted that on 7.5.2005, again a news item was got published in Punjab Kesri under the caption "SDM Ne Diye Police Ko Stay Ki Palna Ke Nirdesh. "

A perusal of the said news item shows that at the most, it can be said that wrong reporting was made. However, there is difference between incorrect reporting and defamation. The said news item by no stretch of imagination could be called defamation, though it could be wrong reporting. If there is wrong reporting, the applicant could lie it before the Press Council of India. However, Sections 500, 501, 502 read with Section 109 IPC were clearly not attracted. Thus, there is no ground to grant leave to appeal.

The present application is accordingly dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

10.2.2015
sjks