

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

216

CRR-3816-2014(O&M)
Date of decision : 31.03.2015

Renu

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and anotherRespondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Paramjeet Singh

Present : Mr.Sushil Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Anil Mehta, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Manish Rathor, Advocate for respondent no.2.

Paramjeet Singh, J. (Oral)

CRM-10146-2015

For the reasons recorded in the application, the same is allowed. Annexure R1 (colly) is taken on record.

CRR-3816-2014 and CRM-36163-2014

Learned counsel for the petitioner has filed the present revision petition for setting aside the order dated 02.04.2014/03.04.2014 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Sonapat whereby the charge under Section 306 IPC was framed against the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that from the reading of FIR no offence is made out and no reference is made to the suicide note in the FIR. Learned counsel further contends that even the story as depicted in the suicide note is not probable. There is no possibility of writing of such a suicide note.

It has been informed by the learned State counsel that two prosecution witnesses have already been examined and their cross examination has been deferred. As per settled law, at

the time of framing of charge, trial Court is not required to elaborately assess the evidence. A perusal of the suicide note indicates that the name of the petitioner figures therein besides other evidence against the petitioner.

In view of the above, this Court does not deem it fit to record any finding with regard to contention raised lest it prejudice the case of the petitioner. However, this Court is satisfied that *prima facie* no ground is made out to allow the petition. There is also delay of 134 days in filing the revision. No cogent reason has been shown to condone the delay.

Dismissed being devoid of merit as well as time barred.

(PARAMJEET SINGH)
JUDGE

March 31, 2015
mamta