

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

CRR-552-2020

Decided on : 20.02.2020

Pritika Sharma

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

PRESENT: Mr. Gursimran Singh Bawa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The instant revision petition has been preferred against the order dated 04.02.2020, passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Amritsar, vide which the application moved by the petitioner under Sections 311 Cr.P.C. (Annexure P-4) was dismissed.

It has been vehemently urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner that when the petitioner (prosecutrix) was examined before the trial Court as PW-1, she was under the threat and pressure of the accused, therefore, she turned hostile and did not support the case of the prosecution. It was, thus, prayed that it was in this background that she had moved an application under Sections 311 Cr.P.C. for her re-examination.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and also gone through the impugned order as well as other material on record.

I do not find any ground to set aside the impugned order, as it is the admitted case of the petitioner that the accused has been in custody and hence, the question of she being threatened by him is hard to digest, more so, when admittedly she had been going to meet the accused in the jail. Not only this, the application under Section 311 Cr.P.C. has been filed by her

after almost two months of conclusion of evidence before the trial Court. It does not appeal to reason that in case she had indeed been threatened by the accused of dire consequences, as a result of which, she turned hostile, why would she still be visiting the accused in the jail. It is strange that despite the threats received by her, she still mustered the courage to go to the jail to meet the accused.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any infirmity and perversity in the impugned order passed by the Court below, which would warrant the interference of this Court to exercise its revisional jurisdiction. Consequently, the instant revision petition stands dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

February 20, 2020

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*