

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

CRR No.4740 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: March 01, 2017

Manjit Singh and another

...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Saravpreet Gurna, Advocate
for the petitioners.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioners have filed this revision petition under Section 401 Cr.P.C. against respondents State of Punjab and Surinder Singh, challenging the impugned order dated 22.11.2016 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Patiala, vide which the application filed by prosecution for amendment of the charge was allowed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that vide impugned order dated 22.11.2016, learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Patiala, allowed the application for amendment of the charge and the charge under Section 307 IPC, in the alternative, was framed. The perusal of the record shows that earlier, charges were framed under Section 308, 323, 341, 506 and 34 IPC and on

the basis of the application of the prosecution and relying upon the medical

evidence, learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Patiala, in the alternative, also framed the charge under Section 307 IPC.

As the application for amendment of the charge or framing alternative charge under Section 307 IPC was allowed vide impugned order dated 22.11.2016, hence, this order is an interlocutory order. No revision lies against the interlocutory order. Therefore, the present revision petition is not maintainable as it has been filed against the interlocutory order.

Resultantly, on this short ground, the present revision stands dismissed being not maintainable.

March 01, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No