

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

279

**CRM-M-578-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.12.2022**

NAVEEN

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Gagandeep Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Prayer in the present petition is for issuance of directions to conduct further investigation in FIR No.414 dated 10.10.2020 under Section 148, 149, 323, 506 and 325 (added later on) IPC registered at PS Gannaru, District Sonipat, by Central Bureau of Investigation or by an Officer not below the rank of Inspector General of Police/Superintendent of Police.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that father of petitioner, namely, Dharambir gave a complaint dated 10.10.2020 to the S.H.O., P.S. Gannaur, Sonapat, to register an FIR against the accused persons but HC Mandeep-respondent No.5 replaced the original complaint with some other complaint, purportedly not signed by the father of the petitioner. He further submits that investigating agency has not registered the FIR adding appropriate Sections because original

complaint was changed by respondent No.5 and that regarding this act of respondent No.5, father of the petitioner had moved a representation dated 08.12.2020 to the Superintendent of Police, District Sonipat-respondent No.3, but till date no action has been taken upon the same.

On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that in the present case, fair and impartial inquiry was conducted and it was found that the allegations were found to be false and that the allegation of the petitioner made in this petition that the complaint dated 10.10.2020 moved by his father, was replaced by respondent No.5 is wrong and result of concoction. He further submits that earlier the petitioner had moved an application to the Magistrate for getting his medical re-examination done and in that application no such issue was raised that the complaint dated 10.10.2020 filed by his father had been replaced.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

As noticed above, inquiry in the present case was duly conducted. Though, the petitioner moved an application before the concerned Area Magistrate to get him medically re-examined by the Board of Doctors, yet the plea that the complaint moved by his father was replaced, was never raised. The petitioner was medically re-examined by the Board of Doctors, PGIMS, Rohtak and as per their report dated 18.11.2020, injuries No.1 to 8 were declared simple and injuries No.9 and 10 grievous in nature. After recording the statements of the witnesses, challan was presented in the present case before the Court concerned against Sukhbir, Rohit, Dhanpat, Rajbir, Sandeep, Deepak and

Rajbala on 02.12.2020.

In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed by this Court.

Dismissed.

05.12.2022

Aman Jain

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No