

The allegations against revisionist are that he was working as a Vaidh at Bhawanigarh. A son of Sukhwinder Kaur (complainant) was working as a Constable with CISF and posted at Mumbai. Complainant

CRR No. 1888 of 2017 (O/M)

Sukhwinder Kaur was suffering from backbone problem and was getting treatment from accused-revisionist. When she discussed her problem with accused, he offered to help her to get transfer of her son from Mumbai to Chandigarh or Bathinda. He stated that Paramjit Singh, Personal Assistant to Maharani Parneet Kaur, who is Union Minister for External Affairs can get the things done. He demanded Rs. 50,000/- and infact got the money from complainant and her husband Jagdev Singh in the presence of witness Gurmeet Singh on 12.11.2009. When the requisite transfer was not got done, the accused refused to return the money. Hence, complainant Sukhwinder Kaur filed a complaint before the Senior Superintendent of Police, who after culminating the investigation, presented the challan against accused before the Court. Before the trial Court, complainant Sukhwinder Kaur appeared as PW1.

The perusal of original file shows that in the statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C., the stand of accused was that he never took money from complainant, claiming that his son is running the business of transport and he does not need money. It was suggested to Sukhwinder Kaur (complainant) that her disease of backbone is very serious disease. It being so, when Sukhwinder Kaur (complainant) was suffering from serious disease of backbone, it is unlikely that she will cook up false allegations against present accused regarding getting her son transferred from Mumbai to Punjab or Chandigarh. The allegations are very serious, in which the Personal Assistant of Maharani Parneet Kaur, the then Union Minister of External Affairs was named. The police after investigation found the allegations to be correct, which are duly supported by the evidence. There is no illegality or infirmity in the findings recorded by the two Courts below.

CRR No. 1888 of 2017 (O/M)

There is no ground to interfere in the quantum of sentence also. Hence,
revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

2.8.2017
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No