

**CRM-15216-2016 in/and
CRR-1765-2016**

-1-

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

232

**CRM-15216-2016 in/and
CRR-1765-2016
Date of Decision:14.11.2018**

DARSHAN SINGH

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

MANDEEP SINGH AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

**Present: Mr. Rohit Jindal, Advocate for
Mr. Sunil K. Nehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.**

Mr. A.S. Gill, AAG, Punjab.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J.(ORAL)

The complainant approached this Court by way of revision petition with the allegation that the accused persons had induced him to pay money for sending his son to Cambodia and also promised that work permit would be obtained for him but the accused persons neither obtained work permit for his son nor did they pay him for his work in Cambodia. Accordingly, FIR No.144 dated 20.08.2011 was registered at Police Station City Jagraon under Sections 420 and 406 IPC.

Respondent No.1- Mandeep Singh being a juvenile, was tried by the Juvenile Justice Board and was convicted under Section 406 IPC vide judgment dated 17.12.2014. However, vide order of sentence of even date passed, he was released on probation on furnishing probationary bonds in a sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety for a period of six months and the

father of the said juvenile namely Darshan Singh was directed to pay costs of ₹20,000/-.

Aggrieved by the aforementioned judgment of conviction and order of sentence, an appeal was filed which has been accepted vide judgment dated 24.12.2015 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana. Hence, the present revision has been filed by the complainant.

A perusal of the impugned judgment shows that the learned Appellate Court has found that the prosecution has failed to establish *mens rea* on the part of the juvenile namely Mandeep Singh and has accordingly acquitted him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any infirmity or perversity in the said finding. Thus, no ground for exercise of revisional jurisdiction of this Court is made out.

Revision petition is accordingly dismissed.

Since the main case has been dismissed on merit, the question of 42 days delay in filing the revision petition is only academic and the application is accordingly dismissed.

14.11.2018
sheetal

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No