

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

324

Decided on : 15.11.2022

CRA-S-1667-SB-2003

Tasvir Singh and others

. . . Appellants(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CRR-2132-2003

Satwinder Singh

. . . Petitioner (s)

Versus

Tasvir Singh and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Jasraj Singh, Advocate for
Mr. JBS Gill, Advocate
for the appellant in CRA-S-1667-SB-2003 and
for respondent in CRR-2132-2003.

Mr. RK Trikha, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRR-2132-2003 and
for the complainant in CRA-S-1667-SB-2003.

Mr. Jaswinder Singh Arora, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This judgment shall dispose of two cases i.e. Criminal Appeal No. S-1667-SB-2003, filed by the accused/appellants i.e. Tasvir Singh, Amrik Singh @ Meeka, Narinder Singh @ Ninda, Daljit Singh @ Jita and Gurtej Singh @ Babbi. and Criminal Revision Petition i.e. CRR No. 2132 of 2003 filed by the complainant, both filed against one common judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 05.09.2003 passed by Additional Sessions Judge (Adhoc), Hoshiarpur, vide which accused/appellants were held guilty for the offences punishable under Sections 148, 323/149 and

324/149 IPC and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two years each and to pay fine of Rs. 1000/- each and in default of payment of fine to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for a period of one month each.

2. On registration of FIR No. 113 dated 14.04.2001, under Sections 307, 341, 326, 324, 323, 148 and 149 IPC at Police Station Sadar, District Hoshiarpur, prosecution had challaned five accused, namely, Tasvir Singh, Amrik Singh @ Meeka, Narinder Singh @ Ninda, Daljit Singh @ Jita and Gurtej Singh @ Babbi.

As per allegations of the prosecution, FIR was registered on the statement of complainant- Satwinder Singh who alleged that on 13.04.2001, he was returning to his village from village Piplanwala, on scooter bearing registration No. PAW-8767 after seeing Baisakhi Fair and at about 7.30 pm when he reached near the house of Sunil Kumar at Village Hedrowal, he saw all the five accused, named here above, standing near the **thara** of the **bohar tree**. All the accused were identified by the complainant as the street light was on at that time. After stopping the scooter of the complainant, accused Gurtej Singh @ Babbi and Daljit Singh @ Jita raised Lalkara saying that he (complainant) be taught a lesson for helping Santosh Kumari in a land dispute. Due to this reason, Gurtej Singh @ Babbi pushed complainant's scooter down from one side and Daljit Singh gave a Kirpan blow towards the head of the complainant, but the blow hit on the complainant's thumb of the right hand when he tried to ward off the blow; Gurtej Singh also gave a kirpan blow on the head of the complainant. Narinder Singh gave a kirpan blow on complainant's head and thereafter, Amrik Singh gave a kirpan blow toward the head of the complainant, but the said blow fell on the index finger of his left hand. In the process of making

attempts to save himself, complainant suffered injuries on the right side of his head also. Complainant fell down on the ground and raised an alarm and then Amrik Singh gave a kirpan blow causing injury to three fingers of the right hand of the complainant. Two gandas blows, one on the right shoulder and second on left arm near elbow were also given by the accused Tasvir Singh. Amrik Singh gave a kirpan blow on the left arm of the complainant. Complainant also sustained scratches on the little finger of his left hand and finger adjoining the little finger. Balwinder Singh, Jasbir Kaur and Harbhajan Singh Lambardar reached on the spot and witnessed the occurrence. They rescued the injured from the clutches of the accused and then accused ran away from the spot with their respective weapons.

Injured was moved to Civil Hospital, Hoshiarpur, where he was medically examined and thereafter, he was referred to CMC, Ludhiana.

3. Prosecution alleged that motive behind the occurrence is the ongoing litigation between one Santosh Kumari and Amrik Singh with regard to some land in which complainant and his family members were helping Santosh Kumari, resulting into the grudge in the mind of the accused persons.

4. During the course of investigation, statement of the injured/complainant was recorded by ASI Rajwinder Kumar @ Rajwinder Singh in CMC, Ludhiana after he being declared fit by the Doctors to make statement. On visiting the spot, a rough site plan was prepared of the place of occurrence, sample of blood stained earth was taken in police possession and the parcels of the same were sealed. Scooter No. PAW-8767 along with photocopy of the registration certificate, pair of slippers were also taken into police possession.

Singh were arrested and in pursuance of their disclosure statements, kirpans which were allegedly used by them in the crime were recovered. Accused Tasvir Singh was arrested on 21.04.2001 and on his disclosure statement, Gandasi was recovered from his possession. Accused Daljit Singh was also arrested.

6. All the alleged recoveries, effected in pursuance to the disclosure statements, were noted down in the recovery memos and said memos were attested by the witnesses. After completion of investigation, all the five accused named hereabove were challaned and final report under Section 173 of the Criminal Procedure Code (Cr.P.C.) was submitted.

After going through the documents relied upon by the prosecution, trial Court found the existence of prima facie charges for the offences under Sections 148, 307, 341, 326, 324, 323 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code.

7. Thereafter, trial commenced against the accused persons.

8. The prosecution, in order to prove its case, had examined 11 prosecution witnesses, which are as under:-

PW1	Dr. Karnail Singh	Medical Officer
PW2	Dr. Subh Ashish	Medical Officer
PW3	Dr. Mark Peacock	Medical Officer
PW4	Dr. Jagdeep Singh	Medical Officer
PW5	Satwinder Singh	Complainant/Injured
PW6	Karnail Singh	Eye witness
PW7	Balwinder Singh	Eye witness
PW8	Arjan Khanna	Eye witness
PW9	Balbir Singh	Eye witness
PW10	HC Tarsem Singh	Investigating Officer
PW11	ASI Rajwinder Singh	Investigating Officer

9. After closing of the prosecution evidence, incriminating evidence was put to the accused for recording of their statements under Section 313

Cr.P.C., who denied all the allegations levelled by the prosecution witnesses.

10. As per statement of the PW 1- Dr. Karnail Singh who conducted medico legal examination of injured Satwinder Singh on 13.04.2001 at 9.30 PM, following injuries were noticed :-

- “1) Incised wound C Shape 10cmx1cm bone deep on the left parietal area of scalp 6cm from midline. Fresh bleeding was present. X-ray was advised.*
- 2) Incised wound 6cm x3/4 cm bone deep left parietal area of scalp. Verticle in direction. 4cm away from midline. Bone deep. Fresh bleeding present. X-ray was advised.*
- 3) Incised wound 10cmx1cm/oblique in direction on the right fronto parietal area. Bone deep. Lower end just above hair line. Fresh bleeding present.X-ray advised.*
- 4) Incised would 10cmx3 cm on the palmer aspect of right hand on the thiner eminence. Wound was deep. Underline musscle vessels were te). cut. Musscles tendess were cut. Vesselgs were cut. Massive bleeding from wound was present.*
- 5) Incised wound on the palmer aspect of right hand at the base of index, middle and ring finger. Wound is bone deep. Fresh bleeding was present. X-ray and Ortho opinion was advised.*
- 6) Incised wound on the dorsem of left index finger over middle I.P. joint underline bone was distocated and was grossly visible to the naked eye. Fresh bleeding present.*
- 7) Lacirated wound 4cmx1cm on the dorsem of left middle finger oblique in direction in the lower half muscle deep.X-ray was advised.*

- 8) *Incised wound 7cmx2.5cm on the postero lateral aspect of left forearm in the lower 1/3rd oblique in direction muscle deep. X-ray was advised.*
- 9) *Incised wound 3cmx1cm S/C deep. 4cm injury No.8.*
- 10) *Incised wound 12 cmx5 cm on the back of left arm in the lower 1/3rd verticle in direction muscle deep. Fresh bleeding was present.*
- 11) *Incised wound 7cmx2 cm on the back of right shoulder joint 4cm below the top of shoulder joint. Horizontal in direction. Muscle deep. There is an abrasion from the medial end of wound 4cm *0.3 cm in size.*
- 12) *Red abrasion 4cmx0.3cm on the back of right shoulder joint verticle in direction (A)."*

As per his deposition injury Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12 were declared as simple and injury Nos. 4 and 6 were declared as grievous, whereas, injuries No.1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 were kept under observations.

It is also stated by the said Doctor that weapon used for injury Nos. 1 to 11 were sharp edged, whereas, weapon used for injury Nos. 7 and 12 were blunt.

From the said deposition one aspect is noticeable that injury Nos. 4 and 6 which are opined to be grievous in nature are on the palmer aspect of right hand and dorsem of the little index finger, which are undoubtedly non vital parts of the body.

11. During the course of cross-examination, PW1-Dr. Karnail Singh has admitted that both the injuries were declared by him as grievous, but there was no advise from his side for x-ray examination of injury Nos. 4 and 6 as

those injuries were meant for treatment purpose only. It is also admitted by

the said Doctor that opinion Ex. PF/1 was given by him on 12.06.2001 without examining the patient and without going through the record of DMC, Doctor further admitted that after 13.04.2001, patient/injured never came to him for treatment nor any record of his treatment was produced before him.

Another relevant part of the statement of doctor is reproduced herebelow:

“It is correct that Kirpan and Gandasi are heavy weapon. Police had not shown me any weapon at any time for getting my opinion. It is correct that had the injury No. 6 being given with Gandasi, there ought to have been a bone cut.”

12. Prosecution also produced the other doctors' statements as PW 2 -Doctor Subhasis Dass, PW3-Dr. Mark Peacock and PW 4-Dr. Jagdeep Singh-Radiologist. Complainant Satwinder Singh being injured also was examined as PW5. After considering the complete evidence of prosecution, trial Court reached to the conclusion that no offence under Sections 326 or 307 IPC is made out. For reaching to the said conclusion, evidence of PW1 Dr. Karnail Singh, PW4 Dr. Jagdip Singh of CMC Ludhiana vis a vis conduct of complainant party was examined.

13. Observation made in para Nos. 20, 21 and 22 by the trial Court in its judgment dated 05.09.2003 with regard to medical evidence is reproduced here below:

20. *“I have considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties.*

21. *PW-1 Dr.Kamail Singh has found 11 incised*

wounds on the person of Satwinder Singh and he declared injury No. 4 and 6 to be grievous. Injury No. 4 is on the palmer aspect of right hand and injury No. 6 is on the dorsum of left index finger. None of those injuries was on the vital part of the body of the complainant. Injury No. 1 to 3 are simple injuries caused by sharp edged weapon on the head of complainant. They were not of serious nature. Dr. Kamail Singh had categorically stated that he opined vide Ex. PF/1 on 12.6.2001 that injuries on the person of Satwinder Singh could have endangered his life if he had not got timely medical help. Any injury can be fatal if medical help is not provided to the victim. Therefore, such a vague opinion of the doctor cannot be accepted. Moreover he had admitted that when Satwinder Singh was examined by him his vitals were normal and he was conscious though he had not given the history of assailants. He has also admitted that patient was referred to CIC, Ludhiana on the request of Balwinder Singh relation of Satwinder Singh. This means that the doctor had not recommended his shifting to CC but he was taken to CC by his relations. He has also admitted that as per bed head ticket Ex. DA condition of Satwinder Singh never deteriorated till he remained admitted in civil Hospital, Hoshiarpur. He has also admitted that both the injuries for which he sought the opinion of Dr. S.S. Dardi, Ortho Surgeon, were on non vital part i.e. thumb and finger. Orthopaedic Surgeon has

not mentioned these injuries to be grievous. He has also admitted that he had not advised x-ray of these injuries because those injuries were meant for treatment purpose only. without x-ray how this doctor can say whether a bone was cut or not. Under Injury No. 4 doctor has mentioned that muscle tendons were cut but the bone was not cut. Under Injury No. 6 he has written that the joint underline bone was dislocated and was grossly to the naked eyes. The wounds were stitched when the patient was taken to CMC. He stated that the lacerated injuries can be caused by rubbing against a hard surface and they can also be a result of fall on rough surface. P-3 Dr. Mark Peacock has stated that Satwinder Singh resided under the treatment and this doctor was his assistant and he has proved report Ex.PD in which injury No. 4,6 to 10 were declared grievous but the doctor who examined Satwinder Singh 1.0. Dr.V.Obedh has not been examined though he is still working in Cic. Statement of P-3 cannot be accepted because his evidence is contradictory to the evidence of Dr.Karnail Singh PW-1 who initially examined the injuries. It has been held in 2002 SCC (Cri.) Page-597 Hajju and another Vs. State of M.P. as under :

"Doctor who examined the injured immediately after the occurrence and prepared wound certificate, finding incised wounds on head caused by sharp edged weapon, whereas doctor who conducted post mortem examination stating that

those injuries were caused by some blunt weapon.

Doctor who first examined the deceased described the nature of injuries fully in conformity with the oral evidence given by the eye witnesses but the doctor who conducted post mortem examination described the injuries in a haphazer manner without proper description of the wounds as to whether they were incised or lacerated wounds. Held, courts below relied on the evidence of the doctor who first prepared the wound certificate of the deceased.

22. *Moreover PM-4 Dr. Jagdeep Singh of CC, Ludhiana had taken as many as six x-ray of the injured including hand and finger and according to him there was no fracture of any bone. His report is Ex. PE and skiagrams are Ex. PE-1/ to Ex. PE-8. SO the evidence of this doctor clinches the matter that there was no bone cut under any injury of the complainant and there- fore the opinion of PW-1 and PW-3 regarding greivous nature of injuries cannot be accepted. Similarly the intention of the accused cannot be inferred that they intended to cause death of victim because the injuries on the vital part were simple in nature and almost all the injuries on the person of complainant are simple in nature. If the accused had intention to kill him, they could inflict much more injuries on his vital parts with great force and it is not expected that the complainant would have survived the by persons.*

so from this it can be reasonable concluded that the intention of the accused was not to cause death of the complainant but was to cause injuries to him. As there is motive for the accused to cause injuries to him, therefore, it cannot be said that they have been falsely implicated in this case. The complainant has mended himself by again saying that he was following the short route to his house and since the accused had the motive to cause him injuries, the common a object can develop immediately after they saw the complainant coming alone. Therefore, all the accused are liable under section 148, 323/149 and 324/149 IPC”

14. After analysing the evidence available on record, learned trial Court came to the conclusion that the appellants could not be held guilty for the offences punishable under Sections 307 and 326 IPC. However, all the accused/appellants were held guilty and convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 148, 323/149 and 324/149 IPC and each of them were ordered to undergo the following sentence:

Section	Imprisonment	Fine (in Rs.)
148 IPC	One year R.I.	-Nil-
324 r/w149 IPC	Two years R.I.	Rs. 1000/- each. In default of payment of fine to further undergo one month R.I., each.
323 /149 IPC	Six months R.I.	-Nil-

concurrently.

15. This is how after being convicted, all the convicts now being appellants, have filed CRA-S-1667-SB-2003, whereas, complainant-Satwinder Singh has filed CRR-2132-2003 asking for enhancement of the sentence of all the convicts.

16. While starting arguments in the matter, learned counsel for the appellants pointed out that in order dated 19.09.2015 passed by this Court it has also been recorded that present appeal qua appellant No. 1-Tasvir Singh and appellant No. 5- Gurtej Singh stands abated on account of their death.

Order dated 19.09.2015 passed in CRA-S-1667-SB-2003, says as under:

*“Present: Ms. Amandip Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. J.B.S. Gill, Advocate for the appellants.*

*Mr. A.S. Klar, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Jaspreet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. R. K. Trikha, Advocate
for the complainant.*

Learned State counsel has placed on record verification report with regard to death of appellant No. 1-Tasvir Singh and appellant No. 5-Gurtej Singh in the shape of affidavit of Sh. Harvinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police (Rural), Hoshiarpur and is the same is taken on record. As per this report, appellant No. 1-Tasvir Singh expired on 14.08.2009 and whereas appellant No. 5-Gurtej Singh expired on 18.12.2006. This report is also supported by the statement of Kulwinder Singh son of Tasvir Singh and Amarjit Kaur widow of late Jaswinder Singh along with copy of death certificates Annexure R-2 and Annexure R-3 of the above said appellants No. 1 and 5 respectively. So, it is satisfied that

appellant No. 1 Tasvir Singh and appellant No. 5-Gurtej Singh have been expired. So this appeal qua them stands abated.

Now the matter is adjourned to 19.10.2018 for making submissions in this appeal qua remaining appellants.”

17. Learned counsel for the remaining appellants i.e. appellants No. 2 to 4 made an attempt to challenge the conviction part of the appellants by submitting that there a is delay of 25 hours in lodging of report, which is totally unexplained. It is also submitted that there was one report lodged with the police on 14.04.2001 at 11.55 AM at the instance of appellant No.1- Tasvir Singh (now deceased), resulting into registration of DDR as Ex. DB.

Thus, it is clear that information in regard to the incident was given prior in time by the accused, than the information sent by the complainant/injured for registration of the FIR.

18. However, said arguments is not acceptable because occurrence took place on 13.04.2001 at 7.30 pm at Village Hadrowal and immediately thereafter, injured was moved to Civil Hospital, Hoshiarpur and was medically examined there at 9.30 pm by Doctor Karnail Singh-PW1, who found 11 incised wounds on the person of the complainant besides one abrasion on right shoulder. Injury Nos. 1 to 3 were on the head, whereas other injures were on the other parts of the body. Looking at the seriousness of the injury, said doctor referred the patient to the CMC Ludhiana. Investigating Officer went to CMC, Ludhiana on 14.04.2001 and recorded the statement of complainant at 6 pm.

19. Undoubtedly, DDR Ex. PB was got lodged at the instance of appellant

No. 1-Tasvir Singh, earlier in time, but the fact is not ignorable that injuries

noticed upon the said Tasvir Singh **were not that serious so he did not feel it proper to even lodge report at the earliest.**

20. As far as lodging of report by the injured complainant later in time is concerned, Court cannot ignore the fact that to look after the injured, especially who has suffered 12 injuries would be the zone of consideration, on priority basis.

Otherwise also, lodging of complaint after the version of the injured- Satwinder Singh will not be material in the present case, because happening of occurrence is almost admitted position in the present case. Therefore, delay in lodging the present case is not at all material.

21. Moreover, suffering of 11 injuries out of total 12 injuries by injured Satwinder Singh substantiates the involvement of all the accused persons, especially when injured is only one and there is no attempt to procure any false witness by projecting simple injuries to them, despite giving statement to the police after the version of the accused party. Thus, argument addressed by the appellants is not sustainable.

22. Another argument is that PW-7 Balwinder Singh is an interested witness and therefore, his statement cannot be made basis for conviction. Even to the mind of this Court, such an argument is of no importance because injured is the best witness in the present case who has explained all the injuries suffered by him in all clear manners. Therefore, to the mind of this Court also, prosecution has completely succeeded in proving the incident as has been explained by the prosecution regarding causing injuries to the sole injured Satwinder Singh at the behest of the appellants before this Court.

23. Now at last, learned counsel for the appellants submits that occurrence in the present case took place on 13.04.2001 i.e. more than 21 years back

and during this period, as already noticed, on account of death of two of the convicts i.e. Tasvir Singh (appellant No. 1) and Gurtej Singh (appellant No. 5) appeal qua them already stands abated. Thus, by sending the remaining appellants i.e. Amrik Singh @ Meeka (appellant No. 2), Narinder Singh @ Ninda (appellant No. 3), Daljit Singh @ Jita (appellant No. 4), back to jail, prosecution or even the complainant party is not going to have any substantial gain rather same would create sustaining of the bad blood amongst the members of same village.

It is also submitted that none of the appellants has ever been found involved in any of the criminal cases except of the present one, till date, after registration of the FIR in question.

24. To clear this aspect, on asking of the Court, learned DAG, Punjab has placed on record photocopies of custody certificates in regard to all the appellants i.e. Tasvir Singh (appellant No. 1), Amrik Singh @ Meeka (appellant No. 2), Narinder Singh @ Ninda (appellant No. 3), Daljit Singh @ Jita (appellant No. 4) and Gurtej Singh @ Bubby (appellant No. 5).

25. As per custody certificate of Tasvir Singh (appellant No. 1), he had remained inside jail in his life time for 05 months and 11 days with no other case till his death.

Similarly, Gurtej Singh @ Bubby (appellant No. 5) had undergone total period of 07 months and 10 days with no registration of any other criminal case to his credit.

Remaining appellants i.e. Amrik Singh @ Meeka (appellant No. 2), Narinder Singh @ Ninda (appellant No. 3) and Daljit Singh @ Jita (appellant No. 4) have also never been found involved in any other case (as

undergone by them as of now is as under:

***As per custody certificate dated 14.11.2022, Appellant No.2
Amrik Singh @ Mika has undergone total period of sentence of 05 months
14 days.***

***As per custody certificate dated 14.11.2022, Appellant No.3,
Narinder Singh @ Ninda has undergone total period of sentence of 07
months 10 days.***

***As per custody certificate dated 15.11.2022, Appellant No.4-
Daljit Singh @ Jeeta has undergone total period of sentence of 01 month
and 04 days.***

26. In view of the aforementioned circumstances, learned counsel for the appellants submits that appellants either be set free by passing an order of probation or the period of undergone sentence be considered as sufficient, looking at the time elapsed after the occurrence and probable consequential reasons, if they are sent back to the jail.

27. While opposing the contention of learned counsel for the appellants, Mr. Jaswinder Singh Arora, DAG, Punjab for the respondent-State, submits that looking at the conduct of the appellants of causing 11 injuries with sharp edged weapon out of 12 injuries, collectively, no sympathetic view can be taken.

28. It has also been contended by the learned state counsel as well as counsel for the revisionist in CRR No. 2132-2003 that appellants be burdened with some amount of compensation payable to the injured or his other family members/legal heirs.

29. I have gone through the case file as well as arguments addressed by learned counsel for the parties.

of an offence under Sections 341, 324, 323, 148 and 149 IPC is fully proved, therefore, I do not find any merit in the arguments advanced by counsel for the appellants. Thus, this Court affirms the finding passed by learned Trial Court and also, the resultant judgment of conviction holding the appellants guilty for committing the respective offences.

30. As far as the submissions qua sentence part is concerned, this Court cannot overlook the strong and vital factual positions that for the last 21 years no case has been registered against any of the appellants. Furthermore, the occurrence dates back to 13.04.2001, and the maximum substantive sentence which has been awarded to the appellants is for a period of two years. This Court also cannot overlook the fact that after analysing the evidence available on record, learned trial Court has specifically observed that “.....it can be reasonably concluded that the intention of the accused was not to cause death of the complainant but was to cause injuries to him”, inasmuch as, though injuries were inflicted on vital parts of the victim, but found to be simple in nature. Accordingly, the appellants were not held guilty for graver offences punishable under Sections 307 and 326 IPC.

31. Even one more aspect is not ignorable that injured and the appellants before this Court are residents of the same village and by sending appellants back to the Jail for undergoing the remaining sentence after a period of two decades may result into the revival of enmity which may not be good for either of the sides or to their future generations.

32. In view of above discussions, CRA-S-1667-SB-2003 is disposed of by allowing to sustain the findings and observations made by learned trial Court. However, sentence part of the order of sentence dated 05.09.2003 is modified to the extent of period already undergone by the appellants in jail.

learned trial Court has not awarded any amount of compensation to the complainant/victim. Therefore, in the given factual circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that some amount of compensation be awarded to the complainant/victim on account of infliction of number of injuries by the appellants. Thus, it is ordered that appellants No. 2 and 3, namely, Amrik Singh @ Meeka & Narinder Singh @ Ninda, who have undergone the custody period of more than five months and seven months, respectively, shall pay an amount of Rs. 20,000/- each, and appellant No. 4-Daljit Singh @ Jita, who has undergone custody period of more than one month only, shall pay an amount of Rs. 50,000/-, to the complainant/victim. It is further directed that the appellants shall deposit their respective amount of compensation before the learned Trial Court within a period of 03 months from today. Upon deposit of the compensation money, the same shall be disbursed to victim, i.e. Satwinder Singh S/o Manjit Singh R/o Hadrowal PO Piplanwala, Tehsil and District Hoshiarpur, after issuing notice in this regard.

34. Criminal Revision petition, i.e CRR-2163-2003, is also disposed of accordingly.

35. Pending miscellaneous application(s) stands disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

15.11.2022
Riya

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