

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No.2784 of 2015

Date of decision: January 12, 2016.

Charanjit Singh

... **Petitioner**

v.

Ajmer Singh and another

... **Respondents**

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

Present: Mr. Gursimran Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *Whether to be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral):

Impugned in the present revision is the judgment dated 28.5.2015 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar affirming the judgment dated 10.2.2014 passed by Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Nakodar whereby accused respondents were acquitted of the charges framed against them.

I have heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has argued that both the courts erred in appreciating the evidence. It is stated that cheating was proved and the contradictions relied upon by the lower court are not material.

I have gone through the judgment of the lower court as well as of the lower appellate court. First of all, there was delay of nine months in lodging the FIR. The lower court discussed the evidence and found that

the version of the complainant cannot be believed. The lower court has given sufficient reasoning in support of its conclusion. The lower court has taken one of the possible view. The conclusion arrived at by the trial court was affirmed in appeal. In this way, both the courts have found that the charges against the accused are not proved. Therefore, in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction, this Court cannot interfere in the concurrent findings of facts recorded by the two courts below.

Dismissed.

January 12, 2016.
kadyan

[Kuldip Singh]
Judge