

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

CRA-AD-214-2022

Date of Decision: 22.12.2022

S*****

..... Appellant(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

..... Respondent(s)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RITU TAGORE**

Present: Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the appellant.

LISA GILL, J.

Appellant, who is the complainant in FIR No.46 dated 25.05.2019, under Sections 376, 389, 420, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Zira, seeks to challenge judgment dated 19.01.2022, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, whereby respondent no.2 has been acquitted of the charges framed against him for the offences as above.

Brief facts necessary for adjudication of the matter are that FIR No.46 dated 25.05.2019 was registered against respondent no.2 on the statement of the complainant recorded on 25.05.2019, Ex.P-1. In the said statement the complainant stated that she was about 29 years old and having completed her Bachelors of Art was involved in domestic household work. She further stated that she got acquainted with respondent no.2 about three years ago and he while alluring her on a promise of marriage, developed physical relations with her against her wishes. It is further stated that the accused would take her to his residence forcibly and commit rape upon her and that he would pressurize her to bring money and gold from her

house on the threat that otherwise he would reveal everything to her family members and would implicate her alongwith her family members in some criminal case as he had relations with some gangsters. The complainant further stated that out of fear she gave a gold bangle (Kara) weighing 1-1/4 tola to the accused. She also gave Rs.15,000/- to him on his demand, however, he did not solemnize marriage with her. The complainant's parents solemnized her marriage with one Jagdeep Singh on 08.04.2019. The complainant stated that when she came to her parental home after marriage on 15.04.2019, the accused met her in the village and invited her for his birthday. The accused is further stated to have threatened her that in case she did not come for his birthday he would reveal their illicit relations to her in laws. Thereafter, the accused is alleged to have taken her to his residence on a motorcycle and committed rape upon her at his residence and thereafter dropped her back at her house in the parental village. It is further stated that the accused nevertheless revealed their illicit relations to her in-laws family due to which a Panchayati divorce took place between the complainant and her husband on 03.05.2019. The complainant alleged that she did not reveal these facts to maintain the honour of the family, however, on 25.05.2019, the accused met her at her parental village and asked her to accompany him to Zira otherwise he would kill her family. It is stated that the complainant thereafter informed her family and then reported the matter to the police.

FIR No.46 dated 25.05.2019 was registered on the basis of the statement of the complainant. Pursuant thereto Investigating Officer SI Shimla Rani (PW5) inspected the spot i.e. house of the accused and prepared the site plan Ex.PW14/A. Statement of the witnesses were recorded and medical examination of the prosecutrix conducted at Civil

Hospital, Zira on 26.05.2019. Statement of the prosecutrix under Section 164 Cr.P.C. was recorded on 26.05.2019.

Accused was arrested on 25.05.2019. Recovery of one mobile phone (Samsung), a motorcycle (Hero Honda) without a registration number, a gold bangle and Rs.15,000/- cash alongwith three photographs were stated to be effected from the accused. Offence punishable under Section 420 IPC was added and on completion of investigation, challan/final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented for commission of offences punishable under Sections 376, 389, 506, 420 IPC.

Case was committed to the Court of Sessions and charges framed against respondent no.2 for commission of the offences as above, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. Prosecution examined as many as 17 witnesses to prove its case and tendered into evidence the exhibits, which are duly detailed in para five of the judgment dated 19.01.2022.

The accused was confronted with the incriminating evidence against him. His statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C. was recorded wherein he denied the incriminating evidence put to him claiming innocence and false implication. Respondent no.2 denied all allegations and denied having ever committed rape upon the prosecutrix or extending any promise of marriage to her. He stated that he was still unmarried and single whereas the prosecutrix had already solemnized marriage with Jagdeep Singh out of her own free will and consent. Respondent no.2 further stated that he belonged to the Hindu community whereas the prosecutrix belonged to the Jatt Sikh community. Brother of the prosecutrix was aware of his friendship with the prosecutrix but did not like the same. The accused further stated that he was a Kabaddi player and he had participated in a tournament thereof, which was organized

at the village of the prosecutrix. Brother of the prosecutrix having a grudge against the accused, it is stated, entered into a quarrel with him at the Kabaddi match and thereafter in connivance with his sister, the local police, Sarpanch and political leaders, falsely implicated him. He further denied having taken any gold articles or money from the prosecutrix and claimed the same have been planted upon him by the police. The photographs MO-1 to MO-3 are stated to have been forged and fabricated by the complainant party in connivance with the police only in order to enhance the gravity of the allegations. In defence, the accused produced photographs Ex.D-1 to D-3, a personal diary of the prosecutrix Ex.D-14 and letters written by the prosecutrix Ex.D-15 to D-18 and closed the defence evidence.

Learned trial Court on considering the evidence on record, facts and circumstances concluded that prosecution had miserably failed to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt and therefore, while extending benefit of doubt to the accused/respondent no.2, acquitted him of the charges levelled against him.

It was concluded by the learned trial Court that the evidence on record did not prove the commission of the offence punishable under Section 376 IPC. Improvements in the statement of the prosecutrix were referred to apart from the fact that there was no reason forthcoming on record to indicate as to why the prosecutrix had kept mum for such long years before lodging the complainant coupled with the fact that she was a mature woman and a graduate. Reference was also made to the photographs Ex.D1 to D-6, diary of the prosecutrix and the letters professing her love and affection for the accused, written by her. Learned trial Court further held that there was no evidence on record to prove that the accused had ever held out any promise

of marriage to the complainant. Recovery of the gold bangle and sum of Rs.15,000/- was also disbelieved as was the allegation that the accused had sent obscene photographs of the victim alongwith himself to family members of the in-laws of the complainant either through his mobile phone or through any other social media platform. Aggrieved therefrom the complainant has filed this appeal.

Learned counsel for the appellant/complainant submits that the learned trial Court has grossly erred in acquitting respondent no.2 of the charges against him. In fact, the sole statement of the appellant, which is totally worthy of credence, is sufficient for conviction of the accused. It is submitted that there is no occasion whatsoever for disbelieving the statement of the prosecutrix. Furthermore, it is submitted that respondent no.2 had clicked objectionable photographs of the appellant alongwith himself, which clearly show that the offence in question had been committed. Furthermore, learned counsel argues that even if it is accepted for the sake of arguments, though vehemently denied, that the appellant was voluntarily in touch with respondent no.2 for three years before registration of FIR, it was only so on the basis of an assurance of marriage by respondent no.2. The accused in such a situation in any case, has no right to commit rape upon the appellant. Accused never solemnized marriage with the appellant despite his promise, therefore, learned trial Court has misread the evidence and not considered it in the correct perspective. It is thus prayed that judgment dated 19.01.2022, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, be set aside. Respondent no.2 be convicted for the commission of offences as charged and sentenced accordingly.

We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have

perused the record, which was requisitioned.

It is pertinent to note that as per the birth certificate of the complainant (Ex.P4), her date of birth is 01.05.1990. At the time of registration of FIR No.46 dated 25.05.2019, she was admittedly 29 years old. As per the allegations in the FIR, accused developed physical relations with the complainant about three years prior thereto on the pretext of marriage. Complainant has also stated that she handed over one gold bangle to the accused, which belonged to her brother and that she also handed over a sum of Rs.15,000/- belonging to her parents on 11.02.2019 on the demand being raised by respondent no.2. When the accused did not fulfill his promise of marriage with her, she was got married off to another person on 08.04.2019. Allegation raised by the complainant is that subsequent to her marriage when she came to her parental home on 15.04.2019, the accused asked her to attend his birthday at his residence at Jira and in case she did not attend, he threatened to reveal their relations to her in-laws. She was allegedly taken to the residence of respondent no.2 at Jira on his motorcycle and dropped back at her parental home in the evening. Accused allegedly committed rape upon her against her wishes at his residence. This action of the accused was again not revealed by the complainant to her parents or anybody else purportedly due to threats given by the accused. In her testimony before the learned trial Court, the complainant stated that the accused nevertheless revealed their relations to her parents-in-law due to which a Panchayati divorce was carried out on 03.05.2019.

The immediate incident complained of is of 25.05.2019 when respondent no.2 is stated to have met the complainant at her parental village and threatened her to accompany him to Zira, failing which he is stated to

have threatened to have her and her family eliminated. In the statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C., the complainant stated that respondent no.2 used to incite her to kill her parents by poisoning them so that she could get their property after their death and to this end he had handed over some mercury to her to be administered to her parents and paternal uncle. Respondent no.2 is also stated to have sent three objectionable photographs Mo-1 to Mo-3. The complainant identified herself in the photographs to her sister-in-law and her husband.

At this stage, it is relevant to refer to Section 375 IPC, which reads as under:-

375 Rape:-

A man is said to commit “rape” if he—

1. penetrates his penis, to any extent, into the vagina, mouth, urethra or anus of a woman or makes her to do so with him or any other person; or
2. inserts, to any extent, any object or a part of the body, not being the penis, into the vagina, the urethra or anus of a woman or makes her to do so with him or any other person; or
3. manipulates any part of the body of a woman so as to cause penetration into the vagina, urethra, anus or any part of body of such woman or makes her to do so with him or any other person; or
4. applies his mouth to the vagina, anus, urethra of a woman or makes her to do so with him or any other person, under the circumstances falling under any of the following seven descriptions:

1. Against her will.
2. Without her consent.
3. With her consent, when her consent has been obtained by putting her or any person in whom she is interested, in fear of death or of hurt.
4. With her consent, when the man knows that he is not her husband and that her consent is given because she believes that he is another man to whom she is or believes herself to be lawfully married.

5. With her consent when, at the time of giving such consent, by reason of unsoundness of mind or intoxication or the administration by him personally or through another of any stupefying or unwholesome Substance, she is unable to understand the nature and consequences of that to which she gives consent.
6. With or without her consent, when she is under eighteen years of age.
7. When she is unable to communicate consent.

Explanations

1. For the purposes of this section, “vagina” shall also include labia majora.
2. Consent means an unequivocal voluntary agreement when the woman by words, gestures or any form of verbal or non-verbal communication, communicates willingness to participate in the specific sexual act;

Provided that a woman who does not physically resist to the act of penetration shall not by the reason only of that fact, be regarded as consenting to the sexual activity.

Exceptions

1. A medical procedure or intervention shall not constitute rape.
2. Sexual intercourse or sexual acts by a man with his own wife, the wife not being under fifteen years of age, is not rape.

Section 506 of Indian Penal Code provides for punishment for criminal intimidation and Section 420 of Indian Penal Code for cheating and dishonestly inducing delivery of property with Section 389 of Indian Penal Code providing punishment for putting a person in fear of accusation of offence in order to commit extortion.

The case set up by the prosecution against respondent no.2 is that he committed rape upon the complainant continuously for a period of three years prior to registration of FIR and took objectionable photographs. Rape was committed by him under threat of exposure of said photographs and as per statement of the complainant herself, the accused would threaten

her by saying that he had relations with gangsters, therefore, he would get his family members killed or implicated in a false case and it is under threat that she handed over a gold bangle belonging to her brother to the accused about a year prior to the registration of FIR. She also handed over a sum of Rs.15,000/- at his demand on 11.02.2019.

It is relevant to note at this stage that the complainant was admittedly 29 years old at the time of registration of the FIR and three years prior thereto also she being 26 years old was a mature educated person. There is no evidence on record to indicate the use of any force on the part of the accused. A contradictory stand has been taken by the complainant to the extent that she was subjected to rape by the accused under threat of him implicating her family members in a false case and doing them to death due to his relations with gangsters and on the other hand she stated that due to a false promise of marriage metted out to her by the accused, physical relations were developed. It is noted that there is evidence of neither. It is pertinent to note at this stage that place of occurrence where the complainant was purportedly subjected to rape is statedly the residence of the accused. Ex. PW14/A is the site plan of the house. It is the case of the complainant herself that mother of the accused and thereafter sister-in-law of the accused lived in the same house. In so far as the incident alleged on 15.04.2019 is concerned, it is admitted by the complainant that mother and sister-in-law of the accused were present at the residence and Ex.D-1 to D-6 are the photographs taken at the time of celebration of the birthday of the accused. Complainant identified the photographs of mother of the accused and accused with her. PW-4 Nirmal Singh, the son of the landlady, who had let out residential portion of the building to the family of the accused stated

that the residential portion has been constructed on the roof top of eleven shops and that one portion of the residence had been let out to the accused at the rate of Rs.3,500/- per month. House of the accused was stated to be at a distance of one kilometer from the police station. PW-5 SI Shimla Rani revealed that house of the accused was indeed in the middle of the main market and at a distance of one kilometer from the police station and there always used to remain a rush from 9:00 AM to 10:00 PM.

It is, thus, a matter of record that residence of the accused was in the midst of a thickly populated area. In all the long years and even on 15.04.2019, no hue and cry was ever raised by the complainant. Though the same by itself may not be material but in the given facts, same is a relevant fact. It is further to be noted that the complainant though has stated that the accused a Brahmin, had threatened her with connections with gangsters, there is no such evidence on record. Even as per the complainant the accused did not have any personal business but was working as a helper at different cloth merchant shops whereas her family, a Jatt Sikh family owned 30 acres of land. There is no allegation or any evidence on record to indicate that accused was involved in any criminal activity. It is thus correctly observed by the learned trial Court that there is no evidence on record to indicate that the accused was an influential person or had any link to gangsters so as to pass threat to the complainant.

Furthermore, the photographs Ex.D-7 to D-13 relate to the marriage of brother of the accused in which the complainant has duly identified herself. Perusal of the photographs do not reveal the element of any force. The photographs Ex.D-1 to D-6 relate to birthday party of the accused on 15.04.2019 subsequent to marriage of the complainant with

another person. Said photographs also do not reveal any element of force and instead reflect the complainant to be quite comfortable in the company of the accused, his mother and others. Ex.D-5, a picture taken after her marriage, even reveals the complainant posing with the accused with her arms around him. The letters Ex.D-15 to D-18 reveal the extent of feelings of the complainant for the accused. The evidence clearly puts paid the allegations that the complainant was subjected to rape under threat by respondent no.2.

The allegation that accused had held out a false promise of marriage to the complainant is also not proved from the record. It is correctly held by the learned trial Court that first and foremost there is no evidence of any promise of marriage and definitely none to indicate that the same, if at all, was false from the very inception. Relation between the victim and the accused was consensual. It is a matter of record that a few days after her marriage, complainant proceeded with the accused to his residence at Zira purportedly under a threat by him, participated in the birthday celebrations and freely socialized with his mother and sister-in-law. It opposed to all probability that in such circumstances she was subjected to rape at his residence in the presence of relatives of the accused and still she took no steps to raise any objection.

It is further a matter of record that there is no evidence whatsoever to indicate as to whom the accused had allegedly sent the obscene photographs of the victim. The complainant herself has not stated anything with clarity on this aspect. In her statement Ex.P-1 complainant stated that accused himself revealed their relationship to her in-law's family. In the Panchayati divorce, which otherwise is not a valid instrument of divorce, it

is stated that accused had sent some photographs on Whatsapp, however, there is nothing on record to indicate as to whom the photographs had been sent. There is no detail of any mobile number. Complainant in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. (Ex.P-2) stated that accused had shown her obscene photographs to her in-law's family. In her testimony before the learned trial Court, she stated that accused had sent these photographs to her sister-in-law and her husband and he also made these photographs viral on the Facebook and Instagram. Learned counsel for the appellant is, however, unable to deny that there is no date or time as to when the photographs were taken and how they came in possession of the victim. Said photographs allegedly produced by the accused during investigation are part of the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C.

Indeed the complainant has given evasive replies to the questions regarding the said photographs. Leave alone produce the mobile of the sister-in-law or her husband, details thereof have also not come on the record. Mobile phone allegedly recovered from the accused was not even sent for forensic investigation for recovery of data and to extract the call detail record. The Investigating Officer in the cross-examination has stated that accused himself produced the photographs and the original source of said photographs was not taken in possession neither were the photographs subjected to forensic lens for checking its authenticity and genuineness. Learned trial Court has rightly held that stand of the prosecution that as the photographs had been produced by the accused himself therefore there was requirement of any further investigation falls to the ground as there is no mention of said photographs in the disclosure statement Ex.PW8/F, though, it is so mentioned in the recovery memo Ex.PW8/G. There is indeed no

evidence on record to connect said photographs either with the mobile phone of the accused or any other device of the accused. There is further no evidence on record to indicate that photographs of the victim with the accused were circulated by the accused on the Facebook or any other social media account. Mobile phone of the victim was also not taken in custody. None from the in-laws family of the complainant was joined in the investigation to prove the alleged circulation of the obscene photographs.

Similarly, recovery of the gold bangle and a sum of Rs.15,000/- given to the accused by the complainant on 11.02.2019 is clearly suspect. To prove recovery of the same, ASI Van Singh (PW-8), ASI Dilbagh Singh (PW-9) were examined and Sukhwinder Singh (PW-12) was examined to prove the bill regarding purchase of said gold bangle on 25.04.2019. Ex.P-3, stated to be the bill regarding the bangle, does not bear any serial number or the signatures of Sukhwinder Singh or the seal of any shop, neither was any record with regard to this alleged bill produced, which clearly appears to be an estimate. It is not denied that there is no mark of identification regarding the gold bangle to indicate that it belongs to brother of the victim. Recovery of this bangle is doubtful in the given factual matrix. No independent witness was joined at the time of recovery though it is stated by PW-8 ASI Van Singh that he tried to join an independent witness but they refused. There is no mention of the persons who had been asked but refused to join or any action taken thereon. PW-9 ASI Dilbagh Singh deposed on similar lines while admitting that at the time of recovery, mother and sister-in-law of the accused were present. PW-2 Balwinder Singh – brother of the complainant has stated that he did not even know that his gold bangle was missing till his sister revealed the same to him. It appears highly improbable

that brother of the complainant would have not realized that his gold bangle is missing for such a long time.

Similarly, recovery of Rs.15,000/- purportedly given by the complainant to the accused on 11.02.2019 is equally suspect as it is opposed to all logic that this amount would have been kept intact as it is, in the cupboard by the accused for 3 – 4 months. Apart from the fact that currency was not identified to be the one handed over by the complainant, it is again highly improbable that the accused would have made such a demand from the complainant, if the money was only to be kept by the accused safely in his cupboard.

Another relevant fact to be noted is that PW-7 LC Kulwinder Kaur, who was attached with SI Shimla Rani (PW-5), was admittedly acquainted with the complainant personally. PW-7 LC Kulwinder Kaur has stated that the victim was her classmate in 10+1 and that she was present at the time of recording of the statement of the victim under Section 164 Cr.P.C. It is duly noted by learned trial Court that PW-7 LC Kulwinder Kaur was got re-examined by Public Prosecutor for the State regarding the said fact but PW-7 has reiterated her stand that she was present when the concerned SDJM recorded statement of the complainant under Section 164 Cr.P.C.

In respect to the argument raised by learned counsel for the appellant that the sole testimony of the prosecutrix is sufficient for conviction of the accused, it is to be noted that the same is indeed a settled position of law as has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Himanchal Pradesh Vs. Asha Ram, 2006 Cri.L.J. 139***. Conviction can doubtlessly be founded on the sole testimony of the prosecutrix unless there

are compelling reasons for seeking corroboration. Evidence of the prosecutrix is put on a higher pedestal than that of a injured witness and minor contradictions and insignificant discrepancies in the statement of the prosecutrix should not be a ground for throwing out an otherwise reliable prosecution case. The *sine qua non* for conviction on the sole testimony of the victim is that it should be consistent, reliable, probable and of sterling quality inspiring the confidence of the Court. However, in case, testimony of the victim does not inspire confidence, it is open to the Court to seek corroboration thereof. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Santosh Prasad alias Santosh Kumar Vs. The State of Bihar, (2020) 3 SCC 443***, has been held that the testimony of the victim should be of sterling quality. Reference has been made to para 22 of its earlier decision in *Rai Sandeep alias Deepu Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), (2012) 8 SCC 21*, which is reproduced as here under:-

5.4.2 In the case of Rai Sandeep alias Deepu (supra), this Court had an occasion to consider who can be said to be a "sterling witness". In paragraph 22, it is observed and held as under:

"22. In our considered opinion, the "sterling witness" should be of a very high quality and calibre whose version should, therefore, be unassailable. The court considering the version of such witness should be in a position to accept it for its face value without any hesitation. To test the quality of such a witness, the status of the witness would be immaterial and what would be relevant is the truthfulness of the statement made by such a witness. What would be more relevant would be the consistency of the statement right from the starting point till the end, namely, at the time when the

witness makes the initial statement and ultimately before the court. It should be natural and consistent with the case of the prosecution qua the accused. There should not be any prevarication in the version of such a witness. The witness should be in a position to withstand the cross-examination of any length and howsoever strenuous it may be and under no circumstance should give room for any doubt as to the factum of the occurrence, the persons involved, as well as the sequence of it. Such a version should have co-relation with each and every one of other supporting material such as the recoveries made, the weapons used, the manner of offence committed, the scientific evidence and the expert opinion. The said version should consistently match with the version of every other witness. It can even be stated that it should be akin to the test applied in the case of circumstantial evidence where there should not be any missing link in the chain of circumstances to hold the accused guilty of the offence alleged against him. Only if the version of such a witness qualifies the above test as well as all other such similar tests to be applied, can it be held that such a witness can be called as a “sterling witness” whose version can be accepted by the court without any corroboration and based on which the guilty can be punished. To be more precise, the version of the said witness on the core spectrum of the crime should remain intact while all other attendant materials, namely, oral, documentary and material objects should match the said version in material particulars in order to enable the court trying the offence to rely on the core version to sieve the other supporting materials for holding the offender guilty of the charge alleged.”

5.4.3 In the case of Krishna Kumar Malik v. State of Haryana

(2011) 7 SCC 130, it is observed and held by this Court that no doubt, it is true that to hold an accused guilty for commission of an offence of rape, the solitary evidence of the prosecutrix is sufficient provided the same inspires confidence and appears to be absolutely trustworthy, unblemished and should be of sterling quality.

5.5 With the aforesaid decisions in mind, it is required to be considered, whether is it safe to convict the accused solely on the solitary evidence of the prosecutrix? Whether the evidence of the prosecutrix inspires confidence and appears to be absolutely trustworthy, unblemished and is of sterling quality?

In the present case, the complainant admittedly a mature educated person has put forth inconsistent versions, which compel the Court to seek corroboration thereof. A perusal of the record reveals that there is indeed no corroboration thereof and in fact the evidence on record belies the version as put forth by the complainant. Therefore, conviction of the accused on the sole testimony of the prosecutrix in this case is not made out. Learned counsel for the appellant is unable to point out any evidence whatsoever to indicate the complicity of the accused in the commission of the offence as alleged.

It is a settled position that there have to be strong, compelling and substantial reasons to set aside acquittal of the accused. Simply because another view may be possible, cannot be a ground for reversing a judgment of acquittal. Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Arulvelu v. State represented by the Public Prosecutor, 2009(10) SCC 206*** held that :-

“ Unquestionably, the Appellate Court has power to review and re-appreciate the entire evidence on record. The appellate court would be justified in reversing the judgment of acquittal only if there are substantial and compelling reasons and

when the judgment of the trial court is found to be perverse judgment. Interfering in a routine manner where other view is possible is contrary to the settled legal position crystallized by aforementioned judgments of this Court. The accused is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty. The accused possessed this presumption when he was before the trial court. The trial court's acquittal bolsters the presumption that he is innocent. This fundamental principle must be kept in view while dealing with the judgments of acquittal passed by the trial court."

Reference in this regard can also be made to judgment of

Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of Rajasthan versus Kistoora Ram, 2022(4) RCR (Criminal) 324**, wherein it is held that it is not permissible to interfere with finding of acquittal unless it is found that the view taken by Court is impossible or perverse. It is settled position of law that acquittal of an accused is not to be set aside only if another view may be possible under the given facts and circumstances.

Learned counsel for the appellant is unable to point out any evidence on record which indicates that the impugned judgment dated 19.01.2022, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, is perverse or suffers from any infirmity or illegality.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, we do not find any ground to interfere for setting aside judgment dated 19.01.2022, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur.

No other argument has been raised.

Accordingly, appeal is dismissed.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

(RITU TAGORE)
JUDGE

22.12.2022

Sunil

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