

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.8005 of 2014 and
CRM-A 349 MA of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : January 27, 2015

Satpal Singh,

..... Appellant.

v.

Surinder Singh and another,

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. GP Vashisht, Advocate
for the appellant.

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

CRM No.8005 of 2014

For the reasons recorded, this application is allowed and delay of 28 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

CRM-A 349 MA of 2014

This appeal has been filed against the judgment of the trial Court acquitting the respondents in a complaint under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC.

The allegations made by the appellant are that the respondents had promised that they would take him to Malaysia and arrange work for him. However, when he went there, he found that he was sent on a tourist

visa and he came back after 2 ½ months.

Counsel for the respondents has argued that the visa of the appellant was extended for one year and for some time he was working also in Malaysia and on these averments, the trial Court held that the appellant had not been able to prove his case beyond reasonable doubt.

The fact that the appellant worked for some time in Malaysia; his visa was extended for one year and he himself returned back to India, found favour with the trial Court to arrive at a conclusion that the appellant had not been able to prove his case beyond reasonable doubt. In the circumstances, benefit of doubt goes to the respondents. Consequently, this appeal is dismissed.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

January 27, 2015
`kk'