

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

**CRR No.1828 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : December 15, 2017**

Parshotam Singh Handa and others **Petitioners**

Versus

State of Punjab **Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Amit Kumar Saini, Advocate for
Mr. Navdeep Chhabra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. R.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the respondent.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Heard.

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 10.02.2016, vide which after the presentation of the challan in case FIR No.267, dated 17.10.2012, under Section 306 read with Section 34 IPC, registered at Police Station City, Ferozepur, learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, framed charges under Section 306 IPC against the petitioners, who happens to be father-in-law, mother-in-law and wife of deceased Vishal Gulati.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has referred to the statement of Vijay Gulati, father of the deceased as well as suicide note and pressed that from the statement of complainant Vijay Gulati as well as suicide note, the ingredients of Section 306 IPC are not made out.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has also relied upon the

Punjab”, 1983(1) RC.R. (Criminal) 553 and “Jagdish Singh v State of Punjab and another”, 2016(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 352.

I am of the view that the charges are to be framed after considering the police report filed under Section 173 Cr.P.C, the statement of witnesses recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. and the documents relied upon by the prosecution. In the statement, there are specific allegations of harassment of deceased by his wife and her parents. It is claimed by the witnesses that due to their harassment, Vishal Gulati committed suicide. The merits of the case are not to be determined at the stage of framing of the charges. The Court is to see the *prima facie* the case. The order dated 10.02.2016 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ferozepur is well reasoned. Therefore, without commenting upon the merits of the case, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order, framing of the charges.

As such, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

December 15, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No