

CRR-1349 of 2015

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

CRR-1349 of 2015
Date of Decision: 21.02.2019

Jagdish Raj

....Petitioner

Versus

Satish Chander and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present:- Ms. Manpreet Kaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. S.K. Saini, Advocate, for the respondents.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Fresh vakalatnama on behalf of the petitioner, superseding earlier counsel, filed in Court today is taken on record.

Petitioner, who is brother of the complainant, has filed this revision against judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 23.04.2012 of the trial Court, whereby respondents were released on probation after holding them guilty under Sections 323, 427 read with Section 34 IPC, directing them to pay ₹9,000/- each, totalling ₹27,000/- as compensation to the petitioner, his brother Hans Raj and legal heirs of deceased Lekh Raj and on furnishing probation bonds in a sum of ₹10,000/- each with one surety of like amount, thereby undertaking to maintain peace and be of good behaviour for a period of one year.

Petitioner as well as respondents, being not satisfied from the aforesaid verdict, approached the First Appellate Court, but remained unsuccessful as their respective appeals were dismissed vide judgment dated

CRR-1349 of 2015

No fruitful argument has been raised by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Perusal of impugned judgment shows that alleged occurrence for which the respondents were held guilty under Sections 323, 427 and 34 IPC and released on probation, pertains to year 1993. Since then more than 25 years have passed. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not able to show that respondents ever violated terms and conditions of their probation bonds.

Pursuing of the present litigation by the petitioner despite the fact that his real brother, who was complainant, had expired during trial and his legal heirs were granted compensation of ₹9,000/- for simple injuries like abrasion and contusions, is clearly a blackmailing device just to extract some more money from the respondents.

I have gone through the impugned judgment and find no illegality or perversity in the same.

Dismissed.

February 21, 2019
R.S.

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No