

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

CRR No.947 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision : 21.10.2016

Tarlochan Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..Respondents

CRR No.1106 of 2015 (O&M)

Tarlochan Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Raveesh Sheokand, Advocate for
Mr. Jasbir Rattan, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab

Mr. Amit Kumar Walia, Advocate
for respondent No.2 in CRR No.947 of 2015.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 to 4 in CRR No.1106 of 2015.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By this common judgment this Court shall dispose of the
aforesaid two petitions as common questions of facts and law are involved

in both the above stated revision petitions.

The instant revision petitions have been filed against the impugned judgments dated 10.12.2014 & 02.01.2015, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur, whereby private respondents were released on probation.

The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur, has committed grave injustice to the petitioner by releasing the private respondents on probation and ignored the fact that the private respondents had caused number of injuries to the petitioner.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the private respondents states that learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur, has rightly set-at-naught the sentence part of the impugned judgments to make the chances for the parties to come at the common platform.

The State has not challenged the impugned judgments of First Appellate Court.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and carefully perused the entire record on file.

The dispute is *inter se* the family members. Respondent-Varinder Kaur is the wife of the petitioner in CRR No.947 of 2015, whereas respondent-Raghubir Singh is the brother of the petitioner in CRR No.1106 of 2015. Therefore, for the welfare of the children of the parties and for making the bitter relations better between the brothers, this Court feels that

learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur has rightly released the private respondents on probation. Moreover, the probation period of six months has already elapsed. During this period, the respondents in both the revisions have not violated the terms and conditions of the probation bond. They were released on probation on 10.12.2014 by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur and period of six months expired on 09.06.2015.

Accordingly, this Court does not find any ground to interfere with the impugned judgments in exercise of its revisional jurisdiction as no material evidence or any circumstance has come on record to establish that there is any defect of procedure or that there is improper acceptance or rejection of evidence by the learned revisional Court. The impugned judgments have been passed after proper appreciation of evidence on record and application of judicial mind.

Consequently, the present revision petitions fail and are hereby dismissed.

21.10.2016

ashok

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No

Whether reportable: Yes / No