

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

**Criminal Revision No.1339 of 2005**

**Date of Decision: December 09, 2015**

Veer Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI**

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr.P.S.Paul, DAG, Punjab.

**Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J.**(Oral)

On 04.11.2014, the following order was passed:-

*“Present : None for the petitioner.*

*Mr.P.S.Paul, DAG, Punjab  
for the respondent.*

*Report with regard to execution of bailable warrants upon the petitioner has been received from learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Moga. It reveals that the petitioner has sold his property and thereafter, his whereabouts are not known.*

*In view of the above, let the surety of the petitioner be summoned for 9.12.2015, through bailable warrants in the sum of ₹25,000/- (Rupees twenty-five thousand only) with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer.”*

In compliance of the above, a report has been

received from learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Moga, that the papers concerning surety bond of the petitioner were not traceable from the record room. On further direction it was reported that the case file was sent to this Court vide despatch No.34 dated 07.06.2010.

The Restorer of this Court has checked the records received from Court below but the personal and surety bond, allegedly executed by the petitioner at the time of suspension of his sentence under the orders of this Court, are not enclosed with the records of Court below.

Learned counsel for the State has produced the affidavit of Superintendent, Sub Jail, Moga, to show the fact that after completion of his sentence, Veer Singh-petitioner was released from the jail on 18.11.2005 and as such, the present criminal revision petition has been rendered infructuous. The said affidavit is taken on record.

On 01.07.2015, this Court had passed the following order:-

*“Present: None for the petitioner.*

*Mr.A.S.Klar, AAG, Punjab.*

*As per order dated 07.11.2015 Mr.Naresh Kaushik, Advocate has appeared on behalf of the petitioner. Notice be issued to Mr.Naresh kaushik, Advocate for 19.08.2015.*

*A specific note be given on the notice that in*

*case of failure of the counsel for the petitioner to appear, the appeal shall be decided without waiting for the petitioner or his counsel, in accordance with law laid down in **K.S.Panduranga vs. State of Karnataka (2013) 3 Supreme Court Cases 721.**"*

In view of **K.S.Panduranga**'s case (supra), this Court with the assistance of learned counsel for the State has perused the material available on record and finds that both the Courts below, on the basis of the material available on record have correctly returned the verdict of the guilt of the petitioner for the offence punishable under Section 25 of the Arms Act for retaining the pistol and cartridges without any licence or permit.

Since the petitioner has already served out the sentence awarded by the Courts below, therefore, the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

Ordered accordingly.

**December 09, 2015**  
seema

**(Naresh Kumar Sanghi)**  
**Judge**