

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No.2288 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.01.2016

Rajinder Kumar

.....Petitioner

versus

Swami Sadanand

.....Respondent

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Amit Gupta, Advocate for
Mr.Vipin Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner

- 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)

CRM No.46032 of 2012

For the reasons mentioned in the application, it is allowed and 111 days delay in filing the present revision petition stands condoned.

CRR No.2288 of 2012

Challenged in the present revision is the judgment dated 25.11.2011, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur, affirming the judgment 18.10.2010, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gurdaspur, vide which, in the State case, the accused -respondent was acquitted of the charge under Section 377 IPC.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have

also carefully gone through the file.

The judgments of both the Courts below show that both the Courts below have discussed the evidence elaborately and expediently and after discussing the same, came to the conclusion that the offences are not proved. The judgments are supported by the sound reasoning. Therefore, there is no ground to interfere in the same.

The revision is accordingly dismissed.

21.01.2016

gk

**(Kuldip Singh)
Judge**