

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

**CRM-M-43985 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 08.12.2016**

Ranjeet Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Vikram Satpaul, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY TEWARI, J.(ORAL)

This petition has been filed for issuance of directions to the official respondents to consider the representations (Annexures P-1 and P-2).

In the first place there is no original of the documents annexed. On asking from the learned counsel as to where is the original of the document (Annexure P-1) he has not been able to show anything. On asking about the original of document (Annexure P-2) he has shown the vernacular of Punjabi letter. There is no explanation as to why document (Annexure P-2) was written as true copy, whereas it is a translated document. Further, a perusal of the vernacular of Annexure P-2 shows that massive additions have been made in it which have been incorporated by

hand in the original document and which learned counsel before me has conceded were not there in the original document.

Moreover, it has wrongly been recorded in P-2 that a copy has been endorsed also to the S.S.P. Patiala. I have found that by the additions made to P-1 and P-2, an attempt has been made to show that there is a positive evidence against one Sahib Singh, whereas in the original document, it was only mentioned as follows :-

“From my inquiries I have come to know that one of the persons was Sahib Singh”.

In the document placed before the Court it has been mentioned that two or three of the persons had a talk with Narain Singh, who were presented them as Sahib Singh and Joban. In this manner a new person is sought to be added in the array of accused and even Narain Singh is sought to be implicated. Had it been a case where this was done by a petitioner, it would have constituted criminal contempt. The fact is that here an advocate has done all this and it is a cause for great dismay. While representing the case of a client it may not be part of the job of an advocate to ascertain whether the case of his client is true or false but to further the interest of a client an advocate can not add material which is not on the record. Though the conduct of the learned advocate leaves much to be desired, I leave the matter at that and dismiss this petition.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending criminal miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

08.12.2016

pooja sharma-I

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No

Yes/No