

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

133.

CWP No. 8536 of 2015

DATE OF DECISION: May 04, 2015

Jasminder Singh

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

Sub Divisional Magistrate designated Appellate Authority and others

Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI

Present: Mr. Sharwan Sehgal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI, J. (ORAL)

On perusing the impugned order passed by the respondents, there appears to be no illegality committed by the respondents with regard to the contention, which was raised by the counsel for the petitioner that there must be videography of the site in question as a proof of commission of a theft as in the present case, a kundi connection was found at the spot by the Junior Engineer, who submitted a report in this regard.

Counsel for the petitioner has, very fairly, conceded that there is no such specific provision under the Statute or the Regulations, which would require the respondents to have videography of the site in question which can be used as an evidence against the petitioner.

The impugned orders are well-reasoned and justified, which do not call for interference by this Court.

In view of the above, the present writ petition is dismissed.

May 04, 2015

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI)
JUDGE**