

125.

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

CRR-1713-2019

Date of decision:22.07.2019

HARDEEP SINGH

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Dilpreet Singh Gandhi Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Petitioner, who is brother of the deceased-Manpreet Kaur, has filed the present revision impugning the order dated 23.04.2019 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran whereby application filed by the petitioner under Section 311 Cr.P.C. to place on record the bills of articles which were given to the accused family at the time of marriage, and to summon the witnesses so as to prove the bills, was dismissed.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that during the pendency of the trial, the petitioner has come across with the bills of electronic goods and jewellery which were necessary to be taken in evidence, but during investigation, the same could not be brought to the notice of the IO.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner.

The accused are facing trial for offence punishable under Sections 304-B/120-B of IPC. The bills were required to be submitted during the course of investigation so that they can form part of the challan,

but the complainant has not brought on record such like bills and for this reason, the same could not be verified by the Investigating Agency. Now under the garb of these bills, the prosecution wants to reopen the case so as to fill up the lacuna.

Accordingly, this Court does not find any reason to interfere in the well reasoned order passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran.

Dismissed.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

22.07.2019
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No