

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

CRM No.M-7351 of 2016

Date of Decision: February 29, 2016

Samay Ram

.... Petitioner

vs.

Dhani Ram and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Singal, 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)

Petitioner seeks quashing of the order dated 24.07.2015 (Annexue P-5) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rohtak as well as the order dated 22.01.2016 (Annexure P-7) passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Rohtak.

The learned Magistrate dismissed the application of the petitioner filed under Section 319 Cr.P.C. to summon respondent Nos.1 to 4 as additional accused.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the case file.

It comes out that in the FIR, no role was attributed to private respondent Nos.1 to 4. They were only seen running from the spot. However, before the lower court, the version was improved.

When the statement was corroborated with the medical evidence, I find that there is nothing wrong in the impugned orders passed by both the courts below. Even during investigation,

respondent Nos.1 to 4 were found innocent. Therefore, considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, no illegality or error is found in the impugned orders.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

February 29, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE