

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR 4621-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.10.2017

Shishpal alias Shishu

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr. Y.P. Malik, Legal Aid Counsel for the petitioner
Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG Punjab

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)

CRM 39101-2017

Since the petitioner is in custody and the delay has occurred on account of his own lapse, therefore, for the reasons mentioned in the application, delay of 691 days in filing the revision is condoned.

CRM stands disposed of.

CRR 4621-2016 (O&M)

Heard.

Judgments of both the Courts below shows that on account of demand of Rs.50/- by the petitioner from the complainant, the occurrence took place. Petitioner straightway gave a brick blow, as a result of which, upper central incisor was broken and there were injuries on the lips and teeth. There are concurrent findings of two courts below. The complainant

had supported the prosecution case, which is further supported by the medical evidence. No ground to interfere in the same.

Resultantly, the present petition stands dismissed.

CRM No.7443-2017

Reply to the application filed in the Court and the same is taken on record.

It comes out that a case pertaining to FIR No.29 dated 28.3.2014 for commission of offence under Section 10 of POCSO Act, 2012 is regarding a different occurrence. Therefore, the sentence awarded in the said case, cannot be ordered to run concurrently with the sentence awarded in the present case.

CRM stands dismissed.

11.10.2017

gk

**(Kuldip Singh)
Judge**

Whether speaking/ reasoned:

Yes

Whether Reportable:

No