

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

**Crl. Misc. No. M-19420 of 2015
Date of Decision: 18.12.2015.**

Gurdial Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. U.K.Agnihotri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

.....

SABINA, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 challenging the orders dated 10.8.2009 (Annexure P-6) and 30.9.2014 (Annexure P-9).

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record available on the file carefully.

Petitioner had filed the complaint Annexure P-1 against respondents No. 2 to 6 levelling allegations that in the advertisement given by the complainant, respondent No. 3 had responded and sent the bio-data of respondent No. 2 wherein respondent No. 2 had been described to be working as Assistant Junior Engineer with the Punjab State Electricity Board. However, on enquiry, it transpired that respondent No. 2 was working as a Lineman. Complainant performed the marriage of his daughter with respondent No. 2. Thereafter respondent No. 2 and the daughter of the complainant immigrated to Canada.

Admittedly, the daughter of the petitioner is presently

residing in Canada. Daughter of the petitioner and respondent No. 2 have got a decree of divorce and respondent No. 2 has returned to India. The Trial Court dismissed the complaint filed by the petitioner vide order dated 10.8.2009 (Annexure P-6) and the said order was upheld by the Court of Revision vide order dated 30.9.2014 (Annexure P-9). It has been noticed by the Court of Revision that there was no material on record to show that there was any material designation difference between the post of Assistant Junior Engineer and Lineman in the concerned department. As per Exhibit P-4, respondent No. 2 had been appointed as a Lineman vide order dated 25.6.1991. As per the photograph on the identity card issued by the Board, respondent No. 2 was described as Assistant Junior Engineer on 5.8.2005. It has also transpired during the course of arguments that the daughter of the petitioner has got re-married after she got a decree of divorce against respondent No. 2.

In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the complaint filed by the petitioner was rightly ordered to be dismissed by the Courts below.

No ground for interference by this Court is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

December 18, 2015
Gurpreet