

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

**CRM No.M-14728 of 2016  
Date of Decision: May 02, 2016**

**Rajesh and others .... Petitioners**

**vs.**

**State of Haryana and another .... Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

**Present:** Mr. Ravinder Singh Randhawa, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

**Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)**

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in this case at the time of medical examination, there was no fracture. Later on, the report was procured that there was fracture and an offence punishable under Section 326 IPC was added.

It is also stated that regarding same occurrence, the petitioner has also lodged the FIR. Therefore, it appears to be a case of version and cross-version.

If some offence is not made out, the petitioner can always argue the same at the time of framing of the charge that particular offence is not made out.

Therefore, there is no ground to quash the FIR in question. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

However, the petitioner is at liberty to raise all the arguments at the time of framing of the charge.

**(KULDIP SINGH)  
JUDGE**

**May 02, 2016**

**sarita**