

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31421-2014 (O & M)
Date of decision:18.01.2016

Balkar Singh and ors.

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Nonefor the petitioner(s).

Mr. Satbir Singh, District Attorney, Haryana.

Rajan Gupta, J. (oral)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of the cross-case dated 28.11.2013 against the petitioners registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325, 326, 285 and 506 IPC and Sections 25, 54 and 59 of the Arms Act on the statement of respondent No.4 Nervair Singh in FIR No.219 dated 19.06.2013 at Police Station Nissing, District Karnal.

Learned State counsel has referred to Para 1 of the reply on merits, which reads as under:-

“That the contents of para No.1 of the petition are admitted being a matter of record and hence needs no reply. However, it is submitted that the petitioner submitted a representation before Superintendent of Police, Karnal, the then Superintendent of Police, Karnal has directed the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Indri to conduct an enquiry and submit his report within 5 days. After this the enquiry was conducted by the Dy. Superintendent of Police, Indri, District Karnal and during the course of enquiry, he has submitted that

the dispute was arose between both the parties and injuries were caused by both the parties against each other. As per enquiry report dated 26.10.2013 and as per direction passed by the then Superintendent of Police, Karnal a cross case under Section 148/149/323/325/326/285/506 IPC and 25-54-59 Arms Act is made out against the petitioners and had requested to investigate the matter in the above noted FIR. It is further submitted that after registration of cross case the petitioners were arrested in the titled FIR. It is also submitted that section 307 IPC was added after doctor's opinion and FSL report.”

It appears Section 307 IPC was added later on but there is no challenge to the same in this petition.

Matter has been heard at some length. Petitioners remain unrepresented.

Dismissed for want of prosecution.

18.01.2016
sukhpreet

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE