

111

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

CRR No.202 of 2015

Date of decision: January 21, 2015

Subhash Chander

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SABINA, J

Petitioner has filed this petition challenging the order dated 27.10.2014, whereby application moved by the prosecution under Section 319 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('Cr. P.C.' for short), for summoning Nidhi, Neelam Rani, Sunny and Charanjit Sehgal to face the trial as additional accused, was dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted from the material on record, it was evident that the persons now sought to be summoned to face the trial as additional accused, were equally responsible in abetting the deceased to commit suicide. In fact, the deceased had consumed poison in police station itself after he was threatened and abused by the persons who were now sought to be summoned as additional accused. Learned counsel has placed reliance on ***Hardeep Singh versus State of Punjab and others*** 2014(1) R.C.R. (Criminal) 623, wherein it was held as under:-

“Question Nos. 1 & III

Q.1 What is the stage at which power under Section 319 Cr.P.C. can be exercised?

AND

Q.III Whether the word "evidence" used in Section 319(1) Cr.P.C. has been used in a comprehensive sense and includes the evidence collected during

investigation or the word "evidence" is limited to the evidence recorded during trial?

A. In Dharam Pal's case, the Constitution Bench has already held that after committal, cognizance of an offence can be taken against a person not named as an accused but against whom materials are available from the papers filed by the police after completion of investigation. Such cognizance can be taken under Section 193 Cr.P.C. and the Sessions Judge need not wait till 'evidence' under Section 319 Cr.P.C. becomes available for summoning an additional accused. ? Section 319 Cr.P.C., significantly, uses two expressions that have to be taken note of i.e. (1) Inquiry (2) Trial. As a trial commences after framing of charge, an inquiry can only be understood to be a pre-trial inquiry. Inquiries under Sections 200, 201, 202 Cr.P.C.; and under Section 398 Cr.P.C. are species of the inquiry contemplated by Section 319 Cr.P.C. Materials coming before the Court in course of such enquiries can be used for corroboration of the evidence recorded in the court after the trial commences, for the exercise of power under Section 319 Cr.P.C., and also to add an accused whose name has been shown in Column 2 of the charge-sheet. In view of the above position the word 'evidence' in Section 319 Cr.P.C. has to be broadly understood and not literally i.e. as evidence brought during a trial.

Q.II Whether the word "evidence" used in Section 319 (1) Cr.P.C. could only mean evidence tested by cross-examination or the court can exercise the power under the said provision even on the basis of the statement made in the examination-in-chief of the witness concerned?

A. Considering the fact that under Section 319 Cr.P.C. a person against whom material is disclosed is only summoned to face the trial and in such an event under Section 319(4) Cr.P.C. the proceeding against such person is to commence from the stage of taking of cognizance, the Court need not wait for the evidence against the accused proposed to be summoned to be tested by cross-examination.

Q. IV What is the nature of the satisfaction required to invoke the power under Section 319 Cr.P.C. to arraign an accused? Whether the power under Section 319 (1) Cr.P.C. can be exercised only if the court is satisfied that the accused summoned will in all likelihood be convicted?

A. Though under Section 319(4)(b) Cr.P.C. the accused subsequently impleaded is to be treated as if he had been an accused when the Court initially

took cognizance of the offence, the degree of satisfaction that will be required for summoning a person under Section 319 Cr.P.C. would be the same as for framing a charge. The difference in the degree of satisfaction for summoning the original accused and a subsequent accused is on account of the fact that the trial may have already commenced against the original accused and it is in the course of such trial that materials are disclosed against the newly summoned accused. Fresh summoning of an accused will result in delay of the trial - therefore the degree of satisfaction for summoning the accused (original and subsequent) has to be different.

Question No. V

Q.V Does the power under Section 319 Cr.P.C. extend to persons not named in the FIR or named in the FIR but not charge-sheeted or who have been discharged?

A. A person not named in the FIR or a person though named in the FIR but has not been charge-sheeted or a person who has been discharged can be summoned under Section 319 Cr.P.C. provided from the evidence it appears that such person can be tried along with the accused already facing trial. However, in so far as an accused who has been discharged is concerned the requirement of Sections 300 and 398 Cr.P.C. has to be complied with before he can be summoned afresh. The matters be placed before the appropriate Bench for final disposal in accordance with law explained hereinabove.”

Section 319 of Cr. P.C. reads as under:-

“Power to proceed against other persons appearing to be guilty of offence:-

- (1) Where, in the course of any inquiry into, or trial of, an offence, it appears from the evidence that any person not being the accused has committed any offence for which such person could be tried together with the accused, the Court may proceed against such person for the offence which he appears to have committed.*
- (2) Where such person is not attending the Court, he may be arrested or summoned, as the circumstances of the case may require, for the purpose aforesaid.*
- (3) Any person attending the Court although not under arrest or upon a summons, may be detained by such Court for the purpose of the inquiry into, or trial of, the offence which he appears to have committed.*

- (4) *Where the Court proceeds against any person under sub-section (1), then-*
- (a) *the proceedings in respect of such person shall be commenced afresh, and witnesses re-heard.*
 - (b) *subject to the provisions of clause (a), the case may proceed as if such person had been an accused person when the Court took cognizance of the offence upon which the inquiry or trial was commenced.”*

Thus, as per the above provision, the Court has ample power to summon any person as additional accused to face the trial with the accused already facing trial, if there is enough material on record to proceed against the said person.

In the present case, petitioner is the father of the deceased. Parmod Kumar son of the petitioner got married to Neelam Rani on 10.02.2008. However, thereafter there arose some matrimonial dispute between the parties. Case of the prosecution is that on 17.03.2013, complainant along with his brother-in-law-Balraj, wife Bimla Rani and son Parmod Kumar had gone to the Police Station. They had gathered near the office of Deputy Commissioner of Police at *Baba Bohar Shah*. At about 1:30 P.M., Charanjit Sehgal, Sonu and Sunny came there and started pushing Parmod Kumar and started abusing him. The said persons insisted that they would send Nidhi to the matrimonial home only in case Parmod Kumar gave in writing that the property which was come to his share, would be given to Nidhi. Thereafter, Parmod got fed up and consumed some poisonous substance.

Petitioner has appeared in the witness box during trial as PW1. A perusal of the cross-examination of the petitioner reveals that Nidhi has already filed a case against her husband under Section 125 Cr. P.C. claiming maintenance in the year 2009-2010. Thus, the relations between the deceased and his wife were not cordial for about more than three years prior to the lodging of the FIR. It appears that due to the strained relations, the complainant

moved application for summoning Nidhi wife of the deceased, Neelam Rani mother-in-law of Parmod Kumar, Sunny brother-in-law of Parmod Kumar and Charanjit Sehgal father-in-law of Parmod Kumar to face the trial as additional accused. The said persons were found innocent during investigation. Learned trial Court, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, had rightly held that there was no substantial evidence on record to show the involvement of the persons now sought to be summoned as additional accused in the alleged crime. There is no quarrel with the preposition of law settled by the Apex Court in Hardeep Singh's case (supra), but the same fails to advance the case of the petitioner.

No ground for interference by this Court, is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

January 21, 2015

m.singh