

\$~34

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 946/2019 & CrI.M.A.3777/2019
POONAM Petitioner

Through: Mr. K.D.Saini, Advocate
versus

PANKAJ JOSHI Respondent

Through: Nemo

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
20.02.2019

%

Petitioner vide order of 9th November, 2016 has been summoned for the offence under Section 495 of IPC and the said order has been upheld by the revisional court vide impugned order of 10th January, 2019.

Petitioner's counsel submits that summoning of petitioner has been made on the basis of some statement made on 1st June, 2016 in HMA No.123/2016, which was not part of the complaint and that there is no whisper of it in the pre-summoning evidence recorded in August, 2016.

Upon hearing and on perusal of impugned order as well as revisional court's order and the pre-summoning evidence, I find that the summoning has not been done solely on the basis of statement made by respondent in HMA proceedings. I find no palpable error in the impugned order as well as summoning order.

This petition and the application are accordingly dismissed while refraining to comment upon the merits of this case.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 20, 2019

S