

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

**CRR No.1020 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.04.2019**

Niranjan Singh ... Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Vinod K. Kaushal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has challenged the impugned order dated 17.12.2018 passed by the Court below whereby the application under Section 319 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for summoning respondent No.2 - Surjit Singh as an additional accused has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that respondent No.2 - Surjeet Singh had been named in the FIR as he had allegedly raised a 'lalkara' as a result of which his son and co-accused Gurmit Singh had run tractor over the petitioner (complainant), fracturing his legs. He contends that there was a *prima facie* evidence for summoning respondent No.2 - Surjit Singh as an additional accused, as a specific role has been attributed to him.

Heard.

The FIR appears to be an outcome of a dispute between the petitioner (complainant) and his daughter-in-law. Surjit Singh is the father

of the daughter-in-law of the petitioner (complainant). It is alleged that Surjit Singh raised lalkara and his son Gurmit Singh, who was stated to be driving the tractor, ran the tractor over the petitioner (complainant) and caused injuries on his legs. However, he was found to be innocent, as he was not present at the spot. There does not seem to be any other evidence which would justify his summoning as an accused to face trial.

Consequently, I do not find any infirmity in the impugned order which warrants interference by this Court while exercising revisional jurisdiction.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

April 29, 2019

rekha sharma

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned? *Yes*

Whether reportable? *No*