

CRM-M-41790-2016 and other connected petitions

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

Date of Decision:19.12.2018

1. CRM-M-41790-2016

Suba Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Central Bureau of Investigation and others

... Respondents

2. CRM-M-45516-2016

Manjit Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Central Bureau of Investigation and others

... Respondents

3. CRM-M-44104-2016

Jagjit Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

Central Bureau of Investigation and others

... Respondents

AND

4. CRM-M-41651-2016

Jhirmal Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

Central Bureau of Investigation and others

... Respondents

CRM-M-41790-2016 and other connected petitions

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Munish Thakur, Advocate for
Mr. Pankaj Bhardwaj, Advocate for
the petitioners in all the petitions.

Ms. Varsha Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Sumeet Goel, Advocate,
for respondent No.1-C.B.I.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India
with Mr. Dheeraj Jain, Senior Panel Counsel for
respondent No.3-Union of India.

Mr. R.S.Bains, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Since point for determination in all these petitions is as to whether the trial Court has committed any error by declining applications of the petitioners for their discharge or whether pendency of criminal proceedings against the petitioners is against law for want of sanction as per provisions of Section 6 of the Punjab Disturbed Areas Act, 1983 (as amended in 1989), therefore, they are taken up together for final disposal by this common order.

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that point for determination involved in these petitions has already been adjudicated by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 20.12.2017 passed in CRR-3854-2016 dismissing a number of petitions. Therefore, he prays that the present petitions may be dismissed in terms of the said order dated 20.12.2017.

CRM-M-41790-2016 and other connected petitions

A relevant extract of the order dated 20.12.2017 passed in CRR-3854-2016 reads as under:

“92. *It has been repeatedly observed by Hon'ble Apex Court that the protection under Section 197 Cr.P.C. is available only when the alleged act done by the public servant is reasonably connected with the discharge of his official duty and is not merely a cloak for doing the objectionable act. The official duty implies that the act or omission must have been done by the public servant within the scope and range of his official duty for seeking protection of Section 197 Cr.P.C. or any other statute, which require prior sanction before prosecution. Same proposition of law is applicable for sanction as per spirit of Section 6 of the Act of 1983 and the petitioners are required to make out on file that their act in each case is covered by the provisions of Sections 4 & 5 of the Act of 1983 and prosecution version is incorrect or false. At the start of trial, the Court as per observations of Hon'ble Apex Court has prima facie to proceed on the basis of prosecution version.*

93. *In view of my above discussion, I find no legal or factual infirmity in impugned orders declining applications of their discharge filed by petitioner(s). However, learned trial Court has observed that at this stage, there is nothing on file to suggest that act of accused was in the discharge of their official duties or provisions of Section 6 of the Act of 1983 are attracted. As per directions of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case*

CRM-M-41790-2016 and other connected petitions

of Devinder Singh (supra), the trial Court has prima facie to proceed on the basis of prosecution version and can re-decide the question afresh in case from the evidence adduced by the prosecution or by the accused or in any other manner it comes to notice of the Court that there was reasonable nexus of the incident with discharge of official duty, the Court shall re-examine the question of sanction and take decision in accordance with law. The above directions nowhere means that the trial Court has to wait till the final decision of the trial. In the event of any such evidence/material coming to its notice even at prior stage, the same can be looked into to re-examine the question of sanction. The observation of trial Court in impugned order(s) that it will look into the question of sanction at the final stage stands modified in the above terms. Revision petitions have no merits, as such, dismissed with above observations. However, applications if any, filed by petitioners under Section 6 of the Act of 1983 or Section 197 Cr.P.C. can be kept pending by trial Court by passing a brief order if it is of the opinion that the evidence on file do not suggest nexus of the incident with the discharge of official duties of petitioners or calling for sanction as per provisions of Section 6 of the Act of 1983 and decide the same at appropriate stage.

94. Before parting it will be relevant to take a note of the fact that after filing of charge-sheet in these cases a long period has elapsed and the prosecution evidence is yet to start.

CRM-M-41790-2016 and other connected petitions

It is neither in the interest of prosecution nor petitioners that sword of prosecution keep on hanging over their heads for such a long period. The trial Court is directed to proceed further in the matter expeditiously and frame a schedule for recording evidence of prosecution at the earliest and then to allow petitioners to lead defence evidence, if required, in support of their plea.”

In view of the above submission made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the present petitions are dismissed in terms of the order dated 20.12.2017 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRR-3854-2016.

19.12.2018
parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No