

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRR-1605-2015
Date of decision: 24.9.2015

Smt. Gurmeet Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr.G.S.Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms.Anmol Grewal, AAG, Punjab.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the impugned judgment dated 29.11.2014 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, whereby appeal of the complainant-petitioner was dismissed, upholding the impugned judgment of acquittal dated 9.12.2013 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Amritsar, complainant-petitioner has approached this Court, by way of instant criminal revision petition, for setting aside the impugned judgments.

Brief facts of the case, as recorded by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar in para 2 of his judgment, are that complainant-Gurmeet Kaur moved an application to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Amritsar, to the effect that one Iqbal Singh resident of their village was mediator in her marriage. His son namely Gurinderpal Singh (accused-respondent herein) was performing a business of spare parts in the shop near Petrol Pump, Chheharta and his residence was at the back side of the petrol pump in the area of Kartar Nagar. The son of complainant Gurmeet Kaur

namely Mehtabpal was a student of B.A 1st year in the year 2004 and after the completion of his graduation, complainant and her husband were thinking of setting their son Mehtabpal Singh in some good job. In the meantime, accused-respondent said that he can manage to get their son employed in corporation. He demanded a sum of Rs.1.50 lacs from the complainant as a consideration for the same. The husband of the complainant was out of money at that time as the construction of their new house at Bhalla Colony was going on. Therefore, he took a loan from police department of Rs.1,35,000/- and gave the same to the accused on 14.1.2004 and rest of the amount of Rs.15,000/- was agreed to be given later on. But after the passage of three months, accused gave excuses to the complainant on one pretext or other. In this way, one year passed. In the March 2005, the accused-respondent showed his inability for getting the son of the complainant employed and said to the complainant that in lieu of their amount of Rs.1,35,000/- he would keep a share of the complainant and her husband in one plot purchased by him but the accused-respondent never showed any document of any plot to the complainant. On 4.8.2006, the accused flatly refused to repay their amount of Rs.1,35,000/-.

On the basis of above-said complaint, FIR was registered against the accused. Investigation was set into motion. Statements of the witnesses were recorded. Accused was arrested and after completion of all usual formalities of necessary investigation, challan under Section 173 Cr.P.C was presented in the Court for trial. Requirement of Section 207 Cr.P.C. was complied with.

Finding a prima facie case against the accused, learned trial Court framed the charges against the accused for commission of offences

under Sections 420 and 506 IPC. The accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. The prosecution, with a view to prove its case, produced as many as seven prosecution witnesses, besides placing on record other documentary evidence.

On closing of the prosecution evidence, statement of the accused was recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C. All the incriminating material was put to the accused. He denied the allegations, alleged false implication and claimed complete innocence. The accused examined one witness in his defence.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and going through the evidence brought on record, the learned trial Court came to the conclusion that the prosecuting agency has failed to bring home the guilt against the accused. Accordingly, the accused was acquitted of the charges framed against him, vide impugned judgment of acquittal dated 9.12.2013.

Dissatisfied, the impugned judgment of acquittal was challenged by the complainant-petitioner, by way of appeal, which also came to be dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, vide impugned judgment dated 29.11.2014. Hence this criminal revision petition, at the hands of complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the cogent and convincing evidence was brought on record, which was sufficient to record conviction of the accused. However, since the learned Courts have failed to appreciate the evidence in correct perspective, the impugned judgments have resulted in miscarriage of justice. He prays for setting aside the impugned judgments, by allowing the present criminal revision petition.

Per contra, learned counsel for the State submits that both the

learned courts below have recorded cogent findings which were based on proper appreciation of evidence and there was hardly any scope to interfere at the hands of this Court. He prays for dismissal of the revision petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, after careful perusal of the record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the contentions raised, this Court is of the considered opinion that keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noticed hereinabove, instant one has not been found to be a fit case, warranting interference at the hands of this Court, while exercising its revisional jurisdiction, which itself is a limited one. To say so, reasons are more than one, which are being recorded hereinafter.

A bare combined reading of both the impugned judgments would show that the learned Courts below have discussed, considered and appreciated each and every relevant aspect of the matter, before arriving at their judicious conclusions. Oral as well as documentary evidence was appreciated in the correct perspective. Having said that, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the learned Courts have committed no error of law, while passing their respective impugned judgments of acquittal and the same deserve to be upheld.

It is the settled principle of law that wherever two views are possible, the view which goes in favour of the acquittal, deserves to be adopted by the Courts. It is not even the argued case on behalf of the petitioner that the view taken by the learned trial Court as well as by the learned Additional Sessions Judge was not one of the possible views. In this view of the matter, it can be safely concluded that the impugned judgments of acquittal do not suffer from any illegality and the same deserve to be

upheld, for this reason also.

The view taken by this Court also finds support from the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Arulvelu & anr. vs. State represented by the Public Prosecutor and anr. 2009(4) RCR (Crl.) 638**. The relevant observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para Nos.39, 40 and 41 in **Arulvelu's** case (supra) read as under:

“In Ghurey Lal v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2008) 10 SCC 450, a two Judge Bench of this Court of which one of us (Bhandari, J.) was a member had an occasion to deal with most of the cases referred in this judgment. This Court provided guidelines for the Appellate Court in dealing with the cases in which the trial courts have acquitted the accused. The following principles emerge from the cases above:

- 1. The accused is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty. The accused possessed this presumption when he was before the trial court. The trial court's acquittal bolsters the presumption that he is innocent.*
- 2. The power of reviewing evidence is wide and the appellate court can re-appreciate the entire evidence on record. It can review the trial court's conclusion with respect to both facts and law, but the Appellate Court must give due weight and consideration to the decision of the trial court.*
- 3. The appellate court should always keep in mind that the trial court had the distinct advantage of watching the demeanour of the witnesses. The trial court is in a*

better position to evaluate the credibility of the witnesses.

4. The appellate court may only overrule or otherwise disturb the trial court's acquittal if it has "very substantial and compelling reasons" for doing so.

5. If two reasonable or possible views can be reached - one that leads to acquittal, the other to conviction - the High Courts/appellate courts must rule in favour of the accused.

40. This Court in a recently delivered judgment State of Rajasthan v. Naresh @ Ram Naresh 2009 (11) SCALE 699 again examined judgments of this Court and laid down that "An order of acquittal should not be lightly interfered with even if the court believes that there is some evidence pointing out the finger towards the accused. This Court has dealt with the scope of interference with an order of acquittal in a number of cases."

41. Careful scrutiny of all these judgments lead to the definite conclusion that the appellate court should be very slow in setting aside a judgment of acquittal particularly in a case where two views are possible. The trial court judgment can not be set aside because the appellate court's view is more probable. The appellate court would not be justified in setting aside the trial court judgment unless it arrives at a clear finding on

marshalling the entire evidence on record that the judgment of the trial court is either perverse or wholly unsustainable in law.”

The law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Arulevlu's** case (supra) has also been followed by a Division Bench of this Court in the case of **State of Haryana v. Aman Kumar and another 2012 (3) RCR (Crl.) 330** and judgment dated 2.11.2012 passed by this Court in **CRM-A-284-MA-2011 (Baljeet Singh v. State of Punjab and others)**.

Reverting back to the facts of the present case and respectfully following the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Arulvelu's** case (supra), it is unhesitatingly held that the learned Courts were well-justified on facts as well as in law, for passing the impugned judgments of acquittal and the same deserve to be upheld, for this reason as well.

No other argument was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that the present petition is misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out.

Resultantly, with the abovesaid observations made, instant criminal revision petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

24.9.2015
mks

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE