

The perusal of the complaint shows that the present petitioner approached the complainant and purchased stamp paper

CRM No. M-13590 of 2016 (O/M)

-2-

from his son and thereafter got the matter typed from the younger son of the complainant. When the son of the complainant demanded charges for stamp paper and typing, petitioner-accused threatened him by saying that he (accused) is a press reporter and that news will be published against him in the newspaper to defame him and he will be put behind the bars on false allegation. Further threats were also given to the effect that he has made all the government employees like Deputy Commissioner/Tehsildar to stand in queue, then who is the complainant. It comes out that later on, infact a news was published on 27.7.2012 in the newspaper 'Samay Ki Taqat', in which the allegations were levelled against stamp vendor without naming him. It comes out that earlier also, the charges were framed under Section 385 IPC, which were challenged before the Sessions Court, in which the observations were made that only offence under Section 385 is not made out and that offence under Section 506 IPC is made out. Learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to the authority of this Court in Tej Singh and others Versus State of Haryana and another, 2013 (1) Law Herald 924, which is not attracted in view of the facts of the present case.

I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the impugned order, framing the charge under Section 506 IPC. However, regarding the newspaper item, the lower Court, after recording some evidence, can always examine whether some offence is made out or

CRM No. M-13590 of 2016 (O/M)

not.

Hence, the present petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

26.4.2016
sjks