

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

**CRM-M-10851-2021
Date of decision : 19.08.2021**

Gurmail SinghPetitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Argued by : Mr. Hakam Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Walia, Asstt. AG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Ms. Poonam Verma, Advocate
for the complainant.

Mr. Tribhuvan Dahiya, Senior Advocate
as Amicus Curiae.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J.

(The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'the Cr.P.C.') for issuance of appropriate directions to the Trial Court to conclude the trial in a time bound manner preferably within three months in case FIR No.75 dated 29.05.2018 registered under Sections 148, 201, 307, 323, 324, 341, 342, 427 and 506 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'the IPC') in Police Station Sadar Dhuri, District Sangrur to which Section 364 of the IPC was added later on.

2. The above-said FIR was registered on statement of complainant-Dharamjit Singh. In his statement Dharamjit Singh alleged

that on 28.05.2018 at about 8:30 p.m. when he was going on his motorcycle and was being followed by his uncle Nihal Dass and younger brother Karamjit Singh on Innova Car, one Scorpio car driven by Jatinder Singh @ Goldi came from behind and hit his motorcycle. Gurmail Singh Ex-panch was sitting on the conductor seat and Saudagar Singh, Pirthi Singh and Jagjit Singh @ Jaggi were sitting on the rear seat of the Scorpio car. They came out of the car and Gurmail Singh raised lalkara to teach them a lesson for interfering in the land of their Dera. Gurmail Singh, armed with Kirpan gave a kirpan blow on his head with intention to kill him which hit him in the middle of the head. Sudagar Singh, armed with iron rod, gave rod blow on his left leg. Prithi Singh, armed with baseball bat, gave blow of baseball bat near his right knee. Jagjit Singh @ Jaggi and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi, armed with dangs, gave dang blows on his right leg. When his uncle Nihal Dass and brother Karamjit Singh came and tried to rescue him, the accused took the complainant to the house of Gurmail Singh in their Scorpio car where his blood stained clothes were washed and he was also given bath. The accused also made his video and threatened him that he should say that he had come to the house of Gele otherwise they would kill him by setting him on fire. The complainant managed to escape from there. Thereafter, his uncle Nihal Dass got him admitted in Civil Hospital, Dhuri.

3. Pursuant to registration of the FIR, the police investigated the case. Accused-Gurmail Singh (the petitioner) and Jagjit Singh were arrested on 15.06.2018 and 22.08.2018 respectively and Police

Report/Challan was presented against them on 10.09.2018. Accused-Sudagar Singh was arrested on 22.09.2018 and supplementary Police Report/Challan was presented against him on 03.11.2018. In the course of trial against them the prosecution evidence was concluded and after recording statements of the accused under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C., the case was adjourned for defence evidence. While the case was fixed for defence evidence, accused-Prithi Singh and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi joined the investigation in compliance with orders dated 17.10.2018 and 01.01.2019 respectively. On completion of investigation, supplementary Police Report/Challan was presented against Prithi Singh and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi on 12.03.2020 and thereupon case was committed to the Court of Session on 12.02.2021. Vide order dated 25.02.2021 learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur attached supplementary Police Report/Challan filed against accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi with the main case and adjourned the same to 16.04.2021 for hearing on charge. Case was thereafter adjourned to various dates last of such dates being 09.08.2021 for hearing on charge.

4. Feeling aggrieved, the petitioner has filed the present petition for issuance of directions to learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur to conclude the trial within three months.

5. The petition has been opposed by the respondent-State and the complainant.

6. Status report by way of affidavit of Sh. Paramjit Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Dhuri, District

Sangrur has been filed on behalf of the respondent-State.

7. Vide order dated 27.07.2021 Mr. Tribhuvan Dahiya, Senior Advocate was appointed as Amicus Curiae to assist the Court in deciding the questions involved in the case.

8. I have heard Mr. Hakam Singh, learned Counsel for the petitioner, Mr. P.S. Walia, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab, learned State Counsel for the respondent-State, Ms. Poonam Verma, learned Counsel for the complainant and Mr. Tribhuvan Dahiya, learned Senior Advocate appointed as Amicus Curiae and I have gone through the relevant record.

9. Mr. Hakam Singh, learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the trial against the petitioner and his co-accused Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh prosecution evidence was concluded. Statements of the petitioner and his co-accused Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C. were also recorded. The case was fixed for defence evidence when the supplementary Police Report/Challan was filed against other co-accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi. Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur has wrongly ordered the same to be attached with the main Police Report/Challan filed against the petitioner and his co-accused Jagjit Singh and Sudagar Singh. The petitioner is in custody since 15.06.2018. Serious prejudice will be caused to the petitioner if Police Report/Challan subsequently filed against co-accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi is attached with the main Police Report/Challan and co-accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and

Jatinder Singh @ Goldi are jointly tried with the petitioner and his co-accused Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh. Therefore, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur may be directed to conduct separate trial against other co-accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi and to conclude the trial against the petitioner and co-accused Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh within three months.

10. On the other hand, Mr. P.S. Walia, Asstt. AG, Punjab, learned State Counsel for the respondent-State and Ms. Poonam Verma, learned Counsel for the complainant have submitted that supplementary Police Report/Challan filed against co-accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi was rightly attached with main Police Report/Challan filed against the petitioner and co-accused Jagjit Singh and Sudagar Singh and their de novo joint trial is mandatory and is being rightly so held. No such direction as prayed for by the petitioner is warranted by and can be given in the facts and circumstances of the case. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

11. Mr. Tribhuvan Dahiya, learned Senior Advocate appointed as Amicus Curiae has submitted that in view of Section 319(4) of the Cr.P.C. co-accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi have to be jointly tried with the petitioner and co-accused Jagjit Singh and Sudagar Singh and de novo trial is mandatory. In support of his submissions learned Senior Advocate appointed as Amicus Curiae has also referred to the judgments in ***Munnalal and others Vs. State of M.P. : 2006 (1) RCR (Criminal) 418*** and ***Shashikant Singh Vs. Tarkeshwar Singh : 2002 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191.***

12. On perusal of the material on record and consideration of submissions made by learned Counsel for the parties and also by learned Amicus Curiae, I am of the considered view that the petition deserves to be allowed.

13. The questions which arise in the present case are (i) whether supplementary Police Report/Challan filed by the Officer in charge of the police station against one or more of the accused is to be mandatorily attached with Police Report/Challan filed earlier by the Officer in charge of the police station against one or more of the other accused; (ii) whether the accused in both the Police Reports/Challans are to be jointly tried and (iii) Whether de-novo trial is required to be conducted in all such cases by recalling all the prosecution or defence witnesses examined earlier irrespective of the stage to which the trial on Police Report/Challan filed earlier has reached.

14. Section 218 of the Cr.P.C., which provides for framing of separate charges for distinct offences, reads as under:-

“218. Separate charges for distinct offences.—

(1) For every distinct offence of which any person is accused there shall be a separate charge, and every such charge shall be tried separately:

Provided that where the accused person, by an application in writing, so desires and the Magistrate is of opinion that such person is not likely to be prejudiced thereby, the Magistrate may try together all or any number of the charges framed against such person.

(2) Nothing in sub-section (1) shall affect the operation of the provisions of sections 219, 220, 221 and 223.”

15. Section 218 of the Cr.P.C. embodies the general mandatory rule that for every distinct offence there must be a separate charge and a separate trial for each such charge against an accused. Sections 219 to

222 of the Cr.P.C. carve out exceptions for joinder of charges and joint trial on such joinder of charges against an accused. Section 223 of the Cr.P.C. carves out an exception to the general rule embodied in Section 218 of the Cr.P.C. and specifies when and what persons may be charged jointly. Section 223 of the Cr.P.C. reads as under:-

“223. What persons may be charged jointly.—

The following persons may be charged and tried together, namely:—

- (a) persons accused of the same offence committed in the course of the same transaction;*
- (b) persons accused of an offence and persons accused of abetment of, or attempt to commit, such offence;*
- (c) persons accused of more than one offence of the same kind, within the meaning of section 219 committed by them jointly within the period of twelve months;*
- (d) persons accused of different offences committed in the course of the same transaction;*
- (e) persons accused of an offence which includes theft, extortion, cheating, or criminal misappropriation, and persons accused of receiving or retaining, or assisting in the disposal or concealment of, property possession of which is alleged to have been transferred by any such offence committed by the first-named persons, or of abetment of or attempting to commit any such last-named offence;*
- (f) persons accused of offences under sections 411 and 414 of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860) or either of those sections in respect of stolen property the possession of which has been transferred by one offence;*
- (g) persons accused of any offence under Chapter XII of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860) relating to counterfeit coin and persons accused of any other offence under the said Chapter relating to the same coin, or of abetment of or attempting to commit any such offence; and the provisions contained in the former part of this Chapter shall, so far as may be, apply to all such charges:*

Provided that where a number of persons are charged with separate offences and such persons do not fall within any of the categories specified in this section, the Magistrate or Court of Session may, if such persons by an application in writing, so desire, and if he or it is satisfied that such persons would not be prejudicially

affected thereby, and it is expedient so to do, try all such persons together.”

16. Section 223 of the Cr.P.C. provides for the joinder of different charges against more than one accused persons and authorises a joint trial of those several accused persons (See ***Brichh Bhuian Vs. State of Bihar : AIR 1963 SC 1120***). Section 223 of the Cr.P.C. permits that a joint trial may be held but does not mandate that it must be held and the word '**may**' used at the beginning of Section 223 of the Cr.P.C. makes it clear that it is an enabling provision and does not make it obligatory to hold a joint trial, even if the conditions of the section are satisfied and it is in the discretion of the Court to order joint or separate trial (see ***Bhagwan Vs. Delhi Admn. : (1975) 1 SCC 866*** and ***Lalu Prasad @ Lalul Prasad Yadav Vs. State through C.B.I. (A.H.D.) Ranchi, Jharkhand (SC) : 2003(4) RCR (Criminal) 160***). An accused person has no right to insist on a joint trial with his co-accused under any circumstances. Reference in this regard may be made to ***A.R. Antulay Vs. R.S. Nayak : AIR 1988 SC 1531***. It is within the discretion of the Court to order joint or separate trial which discretion has to be exercised in accordance with settled principles. In exercise of the discretion, the Court has to take into consideration the stage at which the trial already pending has reached and also whether any inconvenience or prejudice will be caused to the accused already charge-sheeted in case joint trial is ordered. Even where any of the clauses of Section 223 of the Cr.P.C. is satisfied, the Court may, in the exercise of its discretion, refuse a joint trial where, owing to the number of persons involved and the long period involved, a joint trial would (a)

prolong the trial, or (b) cause unnecessary waste of judicial time, (c) cause prejudice to one or more of the accused or (d) confuse or cause prejudice to those accused who had taken part only in some minor offence. Even under the proviso to Section 223 of the Cr.P.C. where the accused charged with several offences not covered by any of the categories in clause (a) to (g) of Section 223 of the Cr.P.C. apply for joint trial, the order for joint trial is in the discretion of the Court which has to consider as to whether such joint trial will cause prejudice to any one or more of such accused persons and whether it is expedient to hold joint trial.

17. Section 210 of the Cr.P.C. lays down the procedure to be followed when there is a complaint case and police investigation in respect of the same offence. Section 210 of the Cr.P.C. reads as under:-

“210. Procedure to be followed when there is a complaint case and police investigation in respect of the same offence.—

(1) When in a case instituted otherwise than on a police report (hereinafter referred to as a complaint case), it is made to appear to the Magistrate, during the course of the inquiry or trial held by him, that an investigation by the police is in progress in relation to the offence which is the subject-matter of the inquiry or trial held by him, the Magistrate shall stay the proceedings of such inquiry or trial and call for a report on the matter from the police officer conducting the investigation.

(2) If a report is made by the investigating police officer under section 173 and on such report cognizance of any offence is taken by the Magistrate against any person who is an accused in the complaint case, the Magistrate shall

inquire into or try together the complaint case and the case arising out of the police report as if both the cases were instituted on a police report.

(3) If the police report does not relate to any accused in the complaint case or if the Magistrate does not take cognizance of any offence on the police report, he shall proceed with the inquiry or trial, which was stayed by him, in accordance with the provisions of this Code.”

18. In ***Munnalal and others Vs. State of M.P. : 2006 (1) RCR (Criminal) 418*** after registration of FIR in respect of offence under Section 302 of the IPC police report was filed against two accused and the case was committed to the Court of Session. Thereafter complaint was filed against all the petitioners in which cognizance was taken. Both the cases were fixed for final arguments. Application under Section 311 of the Cr.P.C. was filed for re-examination of witnesses examined before other petitioners were impleaded claiming that after taking of cognizance against them de novo trial ought to have been conducted which was dismissed by the special Court. M.P. High Court held the joint trial to be proper and allowed the application permitting re-calling of the witnesses for cross-examination.

19. In the present case provisions of Section 210 of the Cr.P.C. are not applicable as the present case involves the question of joint trial on main and supplementary Police Reports/Challans filed under Section 173(2) of the Cr.P.C. and does not involve the question of joint trial on police report and complaint case in respect of the same offence and the observations in ***Munnalal and others Vs. State of M.P. : 2006 (1) RCR (Criminal) 418*** relied upon by Mr. Tribhuvan Dhaiya, Senior Advocate

appointed as Amicus Curiae are not applicable to the facts of present case and are not of any help to this Court in deciding the questions involved in the present case.

20. Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. confers powers on the Court to proceed against other persons appearing to be guilty of offences.

Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. reads as under:-

“319. Power to proceed against other persons appearing to be guilty of offence.—

(1) Where, in the course of any inquiry into, or trial of, an offence, it appears from the evidence that any person not being the accused has committed any offence for which such person could be tried together with the accused, the Court may proceed against such person for the offence which he appears to have committed.

(2) Where such person is not attending the Court, he may be arrested or summoned, as the circumstances of the case may require, for the purpose aforesaid.

(3) Any person attending the Court, although not under arrest or upon a summons, may be detained by such Court for the purpose of the inquiry into, or trial of, the offence which he appears to have committed.

(4) Where the Court proceeds against any person under sub-section (1), then—

(a) the proceedings in respect of such person shall be commenced afresh, and the witnesses re-heard;

(b) subject to the provisions of clause (a), the case may proceed as if such person had been an accused person when the Court took cognizance of the offence upon which the inquiry or trial was commenced.”

21. In ***Shashikant Singh Vs. Tarkeshwar Singh : 2002 (3)***

RCR (Criminal) 191 the FIR was registered against five persons including Tarkeshwar Singh on statement of Shashikant Singh regarding murder of Shivakant Singh. On completion of investigation charge-sheet was filed against Chandra Shekhar Singh. During trial vide order dated 07.04.2001 two persons including Tarkeshwar Singh were summoned vide Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. for being tried with accused Chandra Shekhar Singh. Tarkeshwar Singh challenged the order by filing revision. During pendency of revision petition trial against Chandre Shekhar Singh was concluded and he was convicted vide judgment dated 16.07.2001 High Court set aside order dated 07.04.2001 on the ground that trial against Chandre Shekhar Singh had been concluded and order passed under Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. was without jurisdiction. Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the question whether a person summoned pursuant to an order passed by a Court in exercise of power conferred by Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. can be tried for the offence for which he is summoned after conclusion of the trial wherein such an order of summoning was passed. Hon'ble Supreme Court held in para 12 of its judgment that the mandate of the law of fresh trial is mandatory whereas the mandate that newly added accused could be tried together the accused directory. Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the fact that trial against Chandra Shekhar Singh has already concluded is of no consequence insofar as resident No.1 is concerned.

22. In the present case accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi have been charge-sheeted by the police by filing supplementary Police Report/Challan filed under Section 173 (2)

of the Cr.P.C. and have not been summoned as additional accused by the Court under Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. for being tried together with accused Gurmail Singh (the petitioner) and his co-accused Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh charge-sheeted by the police earlier by filing Police Reports/Challans under Section 173 (2) of the Cr.P.C.. Therefore, provisions of Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. particularly subsection (4) thereof mandating joint de-novo trial and the observations in ***Shashikant Singh Vs. Tarkeshwar Singh : 2002 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*** relied upon by Mr. Tribhuvan Dhaiya, Senior Advocate appointed as amicus curiae are not applicable to the facts of present case and are not of any help to this Court in deciding the questions involved in the present case.

23. It may be observed here that it has now become a general practice that the police, instead of conducting investigation into the offences committed at one time and taking steps for ascertaining complete facts and circumstances and discovering and apprehending all the offenders involved in commission of crime, makes piecemeal investigation and keeps on arresting the accused and filing Police Report/Challan against them one after the other during period spread over not only month but years altogether. The trial Court without any application of mind, follow the course by attaching supplementary Police Report/Challan filed against accused one after the other during period spread over years and ordering de novo trial undoing every time all that has been done previously. It is now well settled that the accused has a fundamental right to speedy trial. The fundamental right of

accused to speedy trial cannot be allowed to be denied to the accused by instrumentalities of the State by recourse to such practice of filing supplementary Police Report/Challan one after the other. Even in the present case three Police Reports/challans have been filed by the police. In a case where trial has commenced and substantially progressed on Police Report/Challan filed against one or more of the accused, supplementary Police Report/Challan filed against one or more of the other accused involved in the commission of the same offences cannot be ordered to be attached with the main Police Report/Challan and de novo joint trial cannot be ordered to be conducted where serious prejudice will be caused to the accused already charge-sheeted by the police. To hold otherwise will not only put the progress of the trial entirely in the hands of the police and the prosecution by enabling them to delay trial by filing Police Report/Challan against the accused one after the other or the accused by enabling them to adopt the dilatory tactics of surrender by one or more of the accused one after the other but also denude the trial Court of the requisite control regarding progress of the trial and will also involve denial of fundamental right of one or more of accused to speedy trial.

24. In the present case accused-Gurmail Singh (the petitioner) and Jagjit Singh were arrested on 15.06.2018 and 22.08.2018 respectively and Police Report/Challan was presented against them on 10.09.2018. Accused-Sudagar Singh was arrested on 22.09.2018 and supplementary Police Report/Challan was presented against him on 03.11.2018. Trial against accused Gurmail Singh (the petitioner), Jagjit

Singh and Saudagar Singh commenced on Police Reports/Challans filed against them. Evidence produced by the prosecution was recorded. Thereafter, statements of accused Gurmail Singh (the petitioner), Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh were also recorded and the case was fixed for defence evidence. While the case was fixed for defence evidence, accused-Prithi Singh and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi joined the investigation in compliance with orders dated 17.10.2018 and 01.01.2019 respectively. On completion of investigation, supplementary Police Report/Challan was presented against Prithi Singh and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi on 12.03.2020 and the case was committed for trial to the Court of Session on 12.02.2021. Vide order dated 25.02.2021 learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur attached supplementary Police Report/Challan filed against accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi with the main case and adjourned the same for hearing on charge.

25. In *Narcotic Control Bureau Vs. Harnath : 1995 Cr.L.J. 2770* where earlier trial of nine accused persons was at its conclusion, clubbing of the trial of the tenth accused charged for the same offence and de novo trial of all the ten accused persons was held not proper.

26. In *Archit Agrawal Vs. State of M.P. (Madhya Pradesh) : 2015(19) R.C.R. (Criminal) 167* Sessions Trial No. 141/2013 titled 'State Vs. Ranu Balmiki' and others was pending before the Sessions Judge, Guna for trial of offences under Sections 307/34, 302, 147, 148, 149 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959. The Police filed supplementary Police Report against accused Sattu @

Shatrughan in the same crime number. In Sessions Trial No. 141/2013, thirty two prosecution witnesses and thirty two defence witnesses were examined and only one defence witness remained to be examined. Hon'ble the Supreme Court had given specific direction to dispose of the case within the stipulated time. The Sessions Judge, Guna vide order dated 16.06.2014 directed to register the supplementary Police Report as Sessions Trial No.141-A/2013 and vide order dated 16.06.2014 ordered separate trial thereof. Accused Abhishek and Archit filed application before the Sessions Court, Guna, and demanded that both the Police Reports should be tried together as the cases had arisen out of the same crime which was rejected by the Sessions Judge, Guna vide order dated 18.04.2015. The order was upheld by Hon'ble Supreme Court while holding that the accused Abhishek and Archit had failed to show how they were prejudiced by the separate trial.

27. No doubt, provisions of Section 223 of the Cr.P.C. are applicable to the present case and joinder of charges and joint trial of accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi with accused Gurmail Singh (the petitioner), Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh is permissible and any order for de novo joint trial of accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi with accused Gurmail Singh (the petitioner), Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh will not cause any prejudice to the complainant and other prosecution witnesses as they have to be summoned and examined again in either case whether it be a de novo joint trial or separate trial but the Court has to give paramount consideration to the fact and cannot ignore the

same that any such de novo joint trial will cause serious prejudice to accused Gurmail Singh (the petitioner), who is in custody since 15.06.2018 the date of his arrest, as de novo joint trial of the case will unduly prolong the period of his custody due to delay in conclusion of the trial which requires re-examination of all the prosecution witnesses examined, recording of statements of accused Gurmail Singh (the petitioner), Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C. again and re-examination of defence witnesses, if any, already examined. Due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case with application of principles of law governing exercise of judicial discretion guided by the paramount interest of justice warrants the only conclusion that the Court should conduct separate trial of accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi. Therefore, order dated 25.02.2021 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur, attaching/clubbing supplementary Police Report/Challan filed against accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi with the main case for their de novo joint trial with accused Gurmail Singh (the petitioner), Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh and adjourning the case for hearing on charge, suffers from material illegality and is liable to be set aside.

28. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and impugned order dated 25.02.2021 and all consequential proceedings/subsequent orders are set aside and learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur is directed to separate the Police Report/Challan filed against accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and

Jatinder Singh @ Goldi from the Police Reports/Challans filed against the petitioner and co-accused Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh and to order separate trial of accused Prithi Singh @ Pritpal and Jatinder Singh @ Goldi and conclude the trial against the petitioner and co-accused Jagjit Singh and Saudagar Singh within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

29. A copy of this order be supplied to learned State Counsel and be also sent to all District and Sessions Judges in the States of Punjab and Haryana and U.T. Chandigarh for information and to learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur for ensuring requisite compliance.

19.08.2021

kothiyal

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No