

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

**RSA No. 3975 of 2016 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 26.02.2020.**

Gian Chand

..... Appellant.

Versus

Balwinder and others

..... Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Lovish Rattan, Advocate, for  
Mr. Surinder Sharma, Advocate, for the appellant.

\*\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)**

The appellant/plaintiff has challenged the judgments and decrees of the Courts below whereby his suit for recovery of damages has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the appellant/plaintiff contends that as the respondents/defendants had defamed the appellant/plaintiff in the eyes of public which had harmed his reputation, the suit should be decreed.

Heard.

The appellant/plaintiff had filed a suit for recovery of damages to the tune of ₹2,00,000/- for causing defamation, libel and slander without any reasonable cause. The appellant/plaintiff, who is a retired Subedar from the Indian Army, was the Sarpanch of village Jalbhe. The respondents/defendants are stated to have made a complaint against him on 22.02.2012 alleging that he had misappropriated funds to the tune of ₹8,00,000/-. On the

basis of the complaint, the matter was inquired into and the allegations were found to be false. The appellant/plaintiff had also referred to the report in the newspaper 'Jagbani' published on 04.04.2011 with regard to the complaint.

The appellant/plaintiff while appearing as PW1 had admitted, in his cross-examination, that two persons, who had harmed his reputation, were Babu and Paramjit and except these persons none had uttered anything against his reputation. Babu was not arrayed as defendant in the plaint while Paramjit, who was defendant No. 2, had expired even prior to the filing of the suit. The other defendants are stated to have signed the complaint which had been made against the appellant/plaintiff for misappropriation of funds. The appellant/plaintiff had also admitted that the newspaper report (Mark A6) mentions the inquiry being conducted against him. It has also come in his cross-examination that the appellant/plaintiff had admitted that he and the respondents/defendants belong to the opposite party in the village.

In view of the above, it is manifest that the appellant/plaintiff was unable to establish his claim for damages. Consequently, the appeal stands dismissed.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

26.02.2020  
Ramesh

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |