

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

**1. CRA-D-266-DB-2003
Date of decision: 24.03.2017**

Beena alias Meena Rani

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

2. CRA-D-324-DB-2003

Darshan Singh

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

3. CRA-D-477-DB-2004

Mohinder Pal

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE T.P.S. MANN
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present: Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate
for the appellant in **CRA-D-266-DB-2003**.

Mr. B.S. Saroha, Advocate
for the appellant in **CRA-D-324-DB-2003**.

Mr. Rajiv Vij, Advocate as Legal Aid counsel
for the appellant in **CRA-D-477-DB-2004**.

Mr. S.S. Dhaliwal, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

H.S. MADAAN, J.

Vide this judgment, we propose to dispose of three appeals i.e. **CRA-D-266-DB-2003** filed by accused-convict Beena alias Meena Rani, **CRA-D-324-DB-2003** filed by Darshan Singh and **CRA-D-477-DB-2004** filed by Mohinder Pal, all three of them being accused, who were convicted and sentenced by the Court of Sessions Judge, Sangrur vide impugned judgment and order of sentence dated 14.01.2003 as follows:-

Name of Convict	Offence	Sentence Awarded
Beena alias Meena Rani	Under Section 120-B IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of ₹2,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year.
	Under Section 302 read with Section 120-B IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of

		₹2,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year.
Mohinder Pal	Under Section 120-B IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of ₹2,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year.
	Under Section 302 read with Section 34 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of ₹2,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year.
Darshan Singh	Under Section 120-B IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of ₹2,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year.
	Under Section 302 read with Section 34 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of ₹2,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year.

The substantive sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

The accused-convicts, who are appellants before this Court pray that the appeals filed by them be accepted, the impugned judgment and order of conviction and sentence be set aside and they be acquitted of the charge framed against them.

Briefly stated, the prosecution story is that on 09.01.2001 a police party headed by ASI Satnam Singh (hereinafter referred to as the Investigating Officer/I.O.) from Police Station, Dhuri was present at bus stop, Dhura in connection with patrolling where complainant-Brij Pal son of Jati Ram Bhatt, resident of Phalgu, Police Station Pundari, District Kaithal, Haryana aged about 50 years accompanied by Kuldeep Singh came across it and complainant-Brij Lal got his statement Ex.PD recorded with the Investigating Officer. Inter alia in the statement the complainant stated that he is a labourer by avocation having three daughters and a son; that his elder daughter Neelam Devi was married with accused-Mohinder Pal son of Om Parkash resident of village Dhura about eight years earlier and the couple was blessed with two sons namely, Sunny and Bobby aged about six years and three years, respectively; that Mohinder Pal used to quarrel with his wife Neelam Devi for last one year since he was having illicit relations with accused-Meena Rani wife of Dayalo, resident of Dhura; that on 08.01.2001 the complainant alongwith his relative Ramesh Kumar son of Devi Dayal, resident of Samana had come to village Dhura to visit his daughter Neelam Devi in her matrimonial home; that Ramesh Kumar was mediator in arranging marriage between Neelam Devi and Mohinder Pal; that they had taken meals from the house of Kuldeep

Singh, a brother-in-law of Ramesh Kumar at about 8:00 p.m., they had gone to matrimonial home of Neelam Devi where they observed that accused-Mohinder Pal alongwith accused-Darshan Singh son of Baldev Singh was taking liquor and Mohinder Pal was abusing his wife Neelam Devi. According to the complainant, he and Ramesh Kumar pacified Mohinder Pal and got the matter patched up between the spouses. Then they returned to the house of Kuldeep Singh.

According to the complainant, he felt somewhat uneasy at night, as such, he alongwith Ramesh Kumar again went to the matrimonial home of Neelam Devi at about 11/11:30 p.m., an electric bulb was glowing there. Then he observed that Mohinder Pal was strangulating Neelam Devi with a rope around her neck whereas Darshan Singh had gagged mouth of Neelam Devi. While they wanted to enter the house and raised alarm “*NA MAARO-NA MAARO*”, then Mohinder Pal having a rope in his hand and Darshan Singh empty handed fled from the spot; that they went inside and saw that Neelam Devi had expired. In the said statement the complainant gave motive for murder of Neelam Devi that Mohinder Pal and Darshan Singh were having illicit relations with Meena Rani and Neelam Devi used to refrain her husband Mohinder Pal from doing so, for that reason, Meena Rani, in connivance with Mohinder Pal and Darshan Singh had murdered Neelam Devi; that due to night time the matter could not be reported to the police, as such, on the next day in the morning after calling their relatives and leaving Ramesh Kumar near the dead body of Neelam Devi, the complainant accompanied by Kuldeep Singh, resident

of Dhura was going to Police Station, Dhuri to lodge report regarding the incident. On the way, at bus-stop of village Dhura they came across police party and complainant got his statement Ex.PD recorded with the Investigating Officer. The statement was signed by the complainant, his signatures were attested by ASI Satnam Singh. ASI Satnam Singh had appended his endorsement Ex.PD/1 below the said statement and sent ruqa to police station through C.Sukhdev Singh at about 1:15 p.m., on the basis of which formal FIR Ex.PD/1 was recorded at police station by Officer-in-Charge, thereafter, he put his endorsement on the ruqa and sent it back to the Investigating Officer.

The police party accompanied by the complainant and Kuldeep Singh had gone to the spot. The Investigating Officer prepared rough site plan of the place of incident as Ex.PO. He had conducted inquest proceedings with regard to unnatural death of Neelam Devi preparing report Ex.PC in that regard. The dead body was identified to him by Satpal Singh son of Jati Ram and Yashpal son of Brij Pal. The Investigating Officer recorded their statements under Section 175 Cr.P.C.. ASI Satpal Singh drafted an application Ex.PB for the purpose of getting post-mortem examination conducted on the dead body of Neelam Devi and handed over the same to CII Harjant Singh and PHG Gurmail Singh directing them to take the dead body to Civil Hospital, Dhuri for getting the needful done.

On 10.01.2001 a police party led by ASI Satnam Singh went to Civil Hospital, Dhuri. By that time postmortem examination had been

conducted on dead body of Neelam Devi. Dead body was handed over to relatives of the deceased vide receipt Ex.PQ. CII Harjant Singh produced before the Investigating Officer a sealed parcel of clothes of the deceased alongwith sample seal bearing impression "VKJ". The parcel was sealed with that very seal impression. It was taken into possession vide recovery memo Ex.PP attested by CII Harjant Singh. CII Harjant Singh had also given a copy of postmortem report of the deceased to the Investigating Officer. ASI Satnam Singh recorded statements of witnesses at the spot. On return to the police station, he deposited the case property with MHC. Thereafter, further investigation was carried out by Inspector/SHO-Rattan Singh (hereinafter referred to as the Investigating Officer/I.O.) of Police Station, Dhuri. During course of investigation all the three accused were arrested in this case vide arrest memo Ex.PE, Ex.PF and Ex.PG signed by accused Beena Rani @ Meena Rani, Darshan Singh and thumb marked by Mohinder Pal, respectively, whereas those memos were attested by ASI Satnam Singh and Jagan Nath. Personal searches of all the three accused were conducted and memos Ex.PH, Ex. PJ and Ex.PK, respectively, were prepared, signed and thumb marked by the accused concerned and attested by PWs aforesaid.

Accused Mohinder Pal was interrogated, during the course of which he had suffered a disclosure statement Ex.PL that he kept concealed a plastic rope on *PARCHATI* of his residential house in the rear portion about which he had exclusive knowledge and he could get the same recovered. Such disclosure statement of Mohinder Pal-accused was

reduced into writing as Ex.PC and it was thumb marked by him and attested by witnesses. Thereafter, accused-Mohinder Pal in pursuance of the disclosure statement made by him led the police party to the specified place and got the rope Ex.P5 recovered. It was converted into a parcel and sealed with the seal of Investigating Officer having impression "RS". Then the said parcel was taken into possession vide memo Ex.PM attested by the witnesses. The Investigating Officer prepared rough site plan of place of recovery Ex.PN.

After completion of investigation and other formalities, challan against the accused was prepared and filed in the Court of Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Dhuri. Copies of documents relied therein were supplied to the accused free of cost as provided under Section 207 Cr.P.C..

Then finding that offence under Section 302 IPC is exclusively triable by the Court of Sessions, the Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Dhuri committed the case to the Court of Sessions Judge, Sangrur vide order dated 27.03.2001.

On receipt of the case, finding a prima facie case, charge for the offences under Section 120-B, 302 read with Section 34 IPC was framed against the accused. Accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. Thereafter, the case was fixed for evidence of prosecution.

During the course of evidence of prosecution, it examined as many as eight (08) witnesses as per details below:-

PW-1 Vijay Kumar Jindal, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Dhuri, who while posted as such on 10.01.2001 at 9:15 a.m. had conducted post-mortem examination on the dead body of Neelam Devi deposed that according to the information supplied by police, she was alleged to have died due to strangulation. As per his observation the length of body was 5' 4". It was of a 25 years' old female, moderately built moderately nourished. Face was swollen, cyanosed, eye balls appearing prominent with froth oozing from mouth and nostrils. Tongue was swollen and cyanosed. Post mortem staining was well developed, purple in colour and fixed. Rigor mortis was present in upper limbs and lower limbs. The body was having clothings of *KAMEEJ* (green), *SALWAR*, *KOTI* (black coloured) and sweater. He noted down the following injuries on her person:-

“A depression (ligature mark) about 1.5 cm wide encircling the neck, brownish in colour, horizontal in direction was present over the neck just below the thyroid cartilages with abrasions and bruises present along its edges. On exploration of neck, subcutaneous tissues were ecchymosed. There was present injury to corresponding neck muscle and carotid arteries. Laryngeal cartilages and tracheae rings were fractured. Hyoid bone was normal.”

Membranes, brain were congested. Walls, ribs of Thorax were healthy and normal. Pleurae were normal and healthy. Both the lungs were congested and on cut section frothy fluid came out. Right

side of heart and large vessels were full of blood and left side was empty. Liver, spleen were congested and organs of abdomen were normal, stomach contained about 100 cc of juicy material. He stated that in his opinion the cause of death in this case was due to asphyxia as a result of interference with respiration which was sufficient to cause death in ordinary course of nature. All these injuries were ante mortem in nature. The time between death and post mortem was within 36 hours. The witness stated that he had handed over to the police, dead body after post-mortem, copy of post-mortem, belongings of deceased in a parcel and police papers 1 to 18 duly signed by him. He proved copy of the post-mortem report as Ex.PA, pictorial diagram showing seats of injuries Ex.PA/1, police request for post-mortem examination conducted Ex.PB, endorsement of SMO Ex.PB/1 directing him to do needful. He further proved the clothes which were there on the dead boy and which were taken off at the time of post-mortem examination as Shirt Ex.P1, SALWAR Ex.P2, KOTI Ex.P3 and Sweater Ex.P4 adding that he had handed over the same to the police. He also proved rope Ex.P5 stating that strangulation is possible with that rope.

PW-2 Brij Lal-complainant provided the eye-witness account of the incident, so did PW-3 Ramesh Kumar. Both of them deposed on the lines of the prosecution version.

PW-4 Raj Rani alias Raj Kaur, who according to the prosecution story on 08.01.2001 had heard Beena Rani alias Meena Rani telling Mohinder Pal and Darshan Singh that if they wanted to

have illicit relations with her, then Neelam Devi be eliminated, did not support the prosecution story, rather she stated that she had seen Mohinder Pal, Beena Rani @ Meena Rani and Darshan Singh, accused present in the Court and they were talking that they had to do some work on that day. Thereafter, she went to her house. She was declared a hostile witness at the instance of learned Public Prosecutor who was allowed to put questions to her in the form of cross-examination, during the course of which she supported the prosecution version.

PW-5 Inspector Rattan Singh, who had carried out investigation in this case from 20.01.2001 onwards deposed in that regard. Whereas PW-6 ASI Satnam Singh, who had investigated this case w.e.f. 09.01.2001 till the investigation was handed over to Inspector Rattan Singh on 20.01.2001 and who on 20.01.2001 was associated with the investigation deposed regarding his part.

PW-7 Jagan Nath before whom, as per prosecution story all the three accused had made extra judicial confession did not support the prosecution story and rather stated that nobody had come to him and no one told anything as regards death of Neelam Devi. It being so, learned Public Prosecutor came up with a request for declaring the witness as hostile. That request was accepted and witness was allowed to be cross-examined by Public Prosecutor, however, lengthy cross-examination failed to elicit any reply favourable to the prosecution.

PW-8 HC Narinder Singh, a formal witness tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex.PT.

With that the evidence of prosecution stood concluded.

Statements of accused were recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C., in which all the incriminating circumstances appearing against the accused were put to them, but they denied the allegations contending that they are innocent and have been falsely involved in this case.

Accused-Mohinder Pal took up a plea that Raj Rani (PW-4) is his aunt and she was go between in his marriage; that she wanted to purchase milk from him to which he did not agree, as such, she got planted this case upon him.

Accused-Darshan Singh came up with a plea that he is friendly with Mohinder Pal due to which he has been falsely implicated in this case on account of enmity.

Accused-Beena @ Meena Rani pleaded that she has got four small children and she used to reside with the sister of her husband namely Sarbati. She does not know as to why she has been falsely involved in this case.

The accused did not lead any evidence in defence.

After hearing the arguments, learned trial Court convicted and sentenced the accused as detailed above.

We have heard learned counsel for the appellants and learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, besides, going through the record and we conclude that appeal filed by accused-Mohinder Pal does not have any merit and is doomed for failure; whereas situation is

just the opposite as regards the appeals filed by accused Beena alias Meena Rani and Darshan Singh. The incident in which Neelam Devi, wife of Mohinder Pal died an unnatural death took place in matrimonial home of Neelam Devi. Mohinder Pal is husband of Neelam Devi. The incident had taken place at night. It is not the case of defence that some intruders had come to the matrimonial home and had committed murder of Neelam Devi. It is certainly not a case of any robbery etc. with no intrusion by any third person alleged or proved. It is for Mohinder Pal to explain as to how his wife had died in the matrimonial home. Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act provides that the *burden of proving fact especially within knowledge is upon the person having that knowledge*. Accused-Mohinder Pal has failed to render any explanation as to how and under what circumstances his wife Neelam Devi was strangled to death at night time, which clearly points out that it was he who had committed the crime.

Then there is eye-witness account of the incident available in the form of statement of complainant-Brij Lal as PW-2, who had categorically stated that on 08.01.2001 at about 11/11:30 p.m. he alongwith Ramesh Kumar went to house of Neelam Devi and they saw Mohinder Pal was strangulating Neelam Devi with the help of rope put around her neck. Although he had added Darshan Singh had gagged mouth of Neelam Devi but that aspect shall be discussed while considering the criminal liability of Darshan Singh. Similarly, PW-3 Ramesh Kumar had deposed in that regard. Although conduct of these

two witnesses has been somewhat unnatural in not reporting the matter to the police till the next day at about 12:30 afternoon but then their presence at the spot stands established. If we see cross-examination of PW-4 Raj Rani alias Raj Kaur who in her examination-in-chief had not supported the prosecution story and was declared a hostile witness, with the Public Prosecutor being granted an opportunity to cross-examine her. But at the same time, the defence was also permitted to cross-examine the witness. During the course of cross-examination on behalf of defence, she stated that during the night she had gone to the house of Neelam Devi when there was "Raula" of her death. It was about 1 / 2 a.m. at night, a number of persons including her sons and neighbour came there, father of Neelam Devi was already there and her other relatives were informed. A complete cross-examination on behalf of defence goes to show that the defence admits presence at the spot of father of Neelam Devi at the time soon after midnight, since no suggestion to the contrary has been given to this witness on behalf of defence. PW-2 Brij Pal in his cross-examination stated that his village is at a distance of about 100 / 125 kilometres from village Dhura. Whereas Ramesh Kumar is resident of Samana, which is at a distance of 60 / 64 kilometers from village Dhura. That being so it is not possible that these two could have been there at the spot at mid night if they had not arrived at village Dhura earlier. If that was so, they would definitely have seen the incident, which is said to have taken place at 11 / 11:30 p.m. Brij Pal, father of Neelam Devi-deceased and Ramesh Kumar-mediator in the marriage between Neelam Devi and Mohinder Pal, had no

other reason to visit village Dhuri, besides, going to the house of Neelam Devi. Therefore, presence at the spot of these PWs at the time of incident stands established and the version given by them that it was Mohinder Pal, accused who had strangled Neelam Devi to death by putting a rope around her neck comes out to be convincing and reliable. Furthermore corroboration to the version comes from the facts as deposed by PW-5 Inspector Rattan Singh and PW-6 ASI Satnam Singh, who stated that accused-Mohinder Pal on being interrogated, while in police custody on 20.01.2001 had suffered a disclosure statement Ex.PL and got recovered rope of plastic, yellow and blue colour Ex.P5 recovered from the Parchati of the room near the entrance gate on left side of the main gate of his residential house. Furthermore, this rope had been shown to PW-1 Dr.Vijay Kumar Jindal, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Dhuri, who had conducted post-mortem examination on the dead body of Neelam Devi and he had opined that strangulation was possible with that rope. Furthermore, the other surrounding circumstances also point towards involvement of the accused in the incident, since accused-Mohinder Pal is not shown to have raised any hue and cry when Neelam Devi had been strangled to death; he had not reported the matter to the police or informed the relatives of the deceased, rather he had fled from the spot after the incident till he was arrested on 20.01.2001 i.e. on the 12th day of the incident. His abscondence after the incident also shows his guilty intention. Thus from all facts and circumstances the irresistible conclusion to be drawn is that it was accused Mohinder Pal who had

committed the murder of his wife Neelam Devi.

Now coming to the criminal liability of other two accused, namely Darshan Singh and Beena alias Meena Rani, who according to the prosecution case considered Neelam Devi to be an obstacle in her maintaining such relation with both of them and had asked them to do away with Neelam Devi, if they wanted to maintain illicit relations with her. On the face of it, this contention seems unconvincing, normally one paramour will not tolerate his beloved maintaining relations with some other person and it is highly unlikely that two of them will join hands in committing murder of wife of one of them. Darshan Singh had absolutely no motive to take part in crime of committing murder of Neelam Devi wife of Mohinder Pal. Similarly, as regards involvement of Beena alias Meena Rai in the incident the prosecution does not claim that she was present at the spot and had taken active part in commission of the crime, rather the prosecution story is that she was part of the conspiracy hatched to commit the murder of Neelam Devi and it was at her instance that Mohinder Pal and Darshan Singh had committed the murder of Neelam Devi. Further we find that there is not enough cogent, convincing and reliable evidence led by the prosecution to prove its charge against Darshan Singh and Beena alias Meena Rani. Though the prosecution had examined PW-4 Raj Rani alias Raj Kaur to prove that she overheard all the three accused talking with each other inasmuch as Beena alias Meena Rani was telling Mohinder Pal and Darshan Singh that if they wanted to have illicit relations with her then Neelam Rani be eliminated. But then

Raj Rani alias Raj Kaur in her examination-in-chief had not supported the prosecution story in that way as a result of which she was declared a hostile witness at the request of Public Prosecutor, who was allowed to put questions in the form of cross-examination. Though in her cross-examination on behalf of the State she admitted it as correct that on 08.01.2001 she had gone to shop of Dharam Pal son of Ram Lal to purchase household goods and when she reached Hanuman Chowk with the goods at about 4:00 p.m., then she saw Beena alias Meena Rani telling Mohinder Pal and Darshan Singh that if they wanted to have illicit relations with her then Neelam Devi be eliminated. In her cross-examination on behalf of accused she had given different types of replies. Therefore, it is very difficult to believe such type of witness who took a vacillating stand in her statement, at one time supporting one party whereas at the other time making a somersault and supporting the other party. Furthermore, it does not seem convincing that the accused would be talking at a public place in such a manner within hearing range of persons passing-by discussing murder of a person as a condition for continuation of their illicit relations. Therefore, the prosecution has been unable to prove the conspiracy part claimed by it involving all the three accused. It has to be kept in mind that PW-7 Jagan Nath, before whom the accused as per prosecution version had gone and made extra judicial confession of their entering into a conspiracy to commit murder of Neelam Devi and Mohinder Pal and Darshan Singh actually doing so, did not toe the prosecution line at all and he clearly denied any of the accused

having approached him or making any extra judicial confession before him. As regards murder of Neelam Devi, he also denied having produced accused before the police, rather he stated that police had obtained his signatures on some papers. Though after being declared as a hostile witness, the Public Prosecutor subjected him to lengthy cross-examination but without any fruitful result. Then it has to be kept in mind that there has been a considerable delay of more than 12 hours in reporting the matter to the police. It seems that as claimed by PW-2 Brij Lal and PW-3 Ramesh Kumar, they had seen Mohinder Pal and Darshan Singh taking liquor in the house of Mohinder Pal on the fateful day at about 8:00 p.m. with the incident having taken place at about 11:30 p.m., for said reason suspecting involvement of Darshan Singh in the incident. He was also named as a culprit having gagged mouth of Neelam Devi while Mohinder Pal had strangulated her to death. As already observed there was little motive for Darshan Singh to take part in murder of Neelam Devi. As far as Beena alias Meena Rani is concerned, there is nothing on record to show that any complaint has been lodged with the police or village Gram Panchayat regarding alleged illicit relations between her, Mohinder Pal or Darshan Singh. As regards the delay part PW-3 Ramesh Kumar stated in his cross-examination that Brij Lal went at 7:30 a.m. to lodge the report and he returned at 9:00 a.m. and the police had seen the dead body. The police told that some rope was put around her neck, the police remained there upto 3/4 hours upto 12 noon and dead body was sent at about 12:30 p.m.. Whereas PW-4 Raj Rani in her cross-examination on behalf of accused

had stated that police was informed probably in the morning and police came early in the morning. PW-6 ASI Satnam Singh stated that he was present in police station on 09.01.2001 and nobody contacted him from midnight of 08.01.2001 till 12.15 noon of 09.01.2001. He stated that he reached the place of occurrence at about 1:30 p.m.. DSP Dhuri had reached the spot at about 1:45 p.m. He stated that he had made inquiry from the persons present there. Inquest report was prepared at about 2:30 p.m.. He stated that he had left police station at 11:15 a.m. on 09.01.2001; they were going directly towards village Dhura and they were having no information till 12:15 noon. Therefore, contradictions are there as regards the information being given to the police, the time of arrival of the police at the spot and time when statement of complainant was recorded. It seems that during such time and after due deliberations and consultations names of Beena alias Meena Rani and Darshan Singh were also introduced. Whereas we find that prosecution has been unable to prove its charge against both these accused conclusively and affirmatively beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt rather a big doubt arises in the mind about their involvement in this case.

Therefore, we find that the impugned judgment of conviction and sentence as regards Mohinder Pal does not suffer from any illegality or infirmity and deserves to be upheld, whereas it is not so as far as accused Beena alias Meena Rani and Darshan Singh are concerned and qua them the impugned judgment is based upon misappraisal of evidence and wrong interpretation of law; therefore, it is bound to be set aside qua

these two appellants-accused.

Resultantly appeal filed by Mohinder Pal, appellant-accused/convict is dismissed whereas as regards appeals filed by appellants-Beena alias Meena Rani and Darshan Singh, those are accepted, the impugned judgment of conviction and sentence qua them is set aside and they are acquitted of the charge framed against them.

Mohinder Pal/appellant-accused is stated to be on bail vide order dated 08.12.2006 granted by this Court while suspending his sentence. His bail is cancelled. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sangrur is directed to issue arrest warrant to get him arrested so as to make him undergo the remaining sentence.

Necessary direction in that regard be issued to the quarter concerned.

24.03.2017
Gaurav Sorot

(T.P.S.MANN)
JUDGE

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|-----|
| 1. | Whether reportable? | Yes |
| 2. | Whether reasoned / speaking? | Yes |