

222

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

CRR No.3265 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of decision: January 15, 2015

Kaka Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Satnam Singh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SABINA, J

Respondents No.1 to 4 had faced trial in FIR No.24 dated 26.03.2008, under Sections 447, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short), registered at Police Station Bhadson, District Patiala. Trial Court vide judgment/order dated 24.04.2012 ordered the conviction and sentence of the respondents No.1 to 4 under Sections 120-B, 447 IPC. Aggrieved against the said judgment/order of their conviction and sentence, respondents No.1 to 4 preferred an appeal and the said appeal was allowed by the Appellate Court vide impugned order dated 19.12.2012. Hence, the present petition by the complainant.

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

Prosecution story in brief is was that complainant was cultivating the land in question. Joginder Singh was also

in possession of the land to the extent of half share, but the possession had been taken by the accused in connivance with the police officials. Complainant was confined in the police station. When the women folk of the village went to the police station to get the complainant released from the confinement, accused inflicted injuries on the women folk.

Learned Appellate Court while ordering the acquittal of the accused, has noticed that the civil suit had been filed by the accused regarding the land in question and the same had been decided in favour of the accused upto this Court. Moreover, complainant had failed to give the description of the land in question as he had failed to disclose the khasra numbers qua which accused had allegedly taken forcible possession. PW4-Ram Singh and PW7-Kirpal Singh had also failed to disclose the khasra numbers of the land in question. Thus, the land in question had not been duly described by the petitioner. The reasons given given by the Appellate Court while ordering the acquittal of the respondents No.1 to 4, are sound reasons and call for no interference.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

January 15, 2015

m.singh