IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

-.-

Crl. Misc. No. M 29737 of 2014
Date of decision: 11.02.2015

Raj Kumar ..... *Petitioner*

Versus

Smt. Mukesh Devi and another .....*Respondents*

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

-.-

Present: Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner

-.-

1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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?

Rekha Mittal, J.

The present petition filed under section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short, Cr.P.C.) lays challenge to the order dated 26.03.2011 (Annexure P4) passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Faridabad and dated 18.07.2014 (Annexure P5) passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad whereby the complaint filed by the petitioner against the accused has been dismissed qua the respondents and order passed by the trial Court has been affirmed in revision.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner and perused the records and find no reason to interfere in concurrent findings recorded by the Courts below that in view of allegations in the complaint and evidence adduced during preliminary inquiry, no *prima facie* case is made out against the

MOHAN LAL BIMBRA
2015.02.13 10:35
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh

respondents for summoning them for committing offence of forgery in regard whereof other accused namely Ajeet Singh Bhati, Anil Kumar and Ravinder Kumar were ordered to be summoned by the trial Magistrate for offence punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

For the reasons aforesaid, finding no merit, the petition is dismissed in limine.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

11.02.2015
mohan

MOHAN LAL BIMBRA
2015.02.13 10:35
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh