

239 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-18878 of 2014
Date of Decision: January 20, 2015

Sarabjit Kaur

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Ankit Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

- 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of the order dated 13.06.2013 (Annexure P-6) passed by learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Smana, whereby the charge under Section 420 read with Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short 'IPC') was framed against the petitioner. Also challenged the order dated 20.11.2013 (Annexure P-8) passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Patiala, whereby the revision filed by the petitioner against the said order was dismissed.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute that earlier the petitioner had approached to this Court by way of filing CRM No.M-40186 of 2012 for quashing of the FIR No.228, dated 03.09.2012, under Section 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Patran, District Patiala. The same was disposed of on 16.05.2013 with the observations that the petitioner

has not come to the Court with clean hands and that he is left to raise the pleas at the time of framing of the charge. All these pleas were raised by the petitioner and considered by the trial court as well as by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Patiala.

The present petition is nothing but the revision against the revision, which is otherwise not permissible. The remedy of quashing of the FIR has already been availed by the petitioner. The trial court has framed the charges, finding the sufficient material against the petitioner. Therefore, it does not deem proper to comment upon the merits of the case and evidentiary value of any document on the file.

Hence, the present petition is dismissed.

January 20, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE