

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

CRM-M-32401-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 28.07.2022

Jaibir Singh Ranga

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Tarundeep Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. Narender Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the petition is for quashing/setting aside of order dated 13.07.2022 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Jind, whereby the application filed by the petition for issuance of direction to procure the investigation report dated 30.08.2017 conducted by the Assistant Superintendent of Police (ASP) Hansi, and for compliance of direction passed by the ASP to concerned SHO in FIR No. 193 dated 25.05.2017, registered under Sections 323, 341, 120-B IPC read with Section 34 IPC and later on added Section 307 IPC, at Police Station Safidon, District Jind, has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the present case, an enquiry was conducted by an IPS Officer-ASP, Hansi, and the progress report was submitted by the said officer, which was not made the part of the challan and when the petitioner preferred an application for issuance of direction to the Investigating Officer to provide the copy of the additional documents, the same was dismissed by the learned Sessions Judge, Jind.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have also gone through the paper-book.

Perusal of the record would reveal that the learned Sessions Judge, Jind, has rightly dismissed the application preferred by the petitioner for issuance of direction to the Investigating Officer to provide the additional documents, vide order dated 13.07.2022. The relevant Para of the order dated 13.07.2022 would read as under:-

“From the afore discussed, it only appears that the present application has been moved to delay the proceedings and the same thing is even revealed from the record that since more than two years after having received this case by way of commitment, charge could not be framed and the trial could not be begin. Neither the document which applicant/accused is seeking was part of documents attached with the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. nor as per the version of the prosecution was relevant in such manner that it was required to be attached with the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. and the Court also does not find anything on record to invoke provisions of Section 91 Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the present application stands dismissed.”.

In view of the above, no further orders are called for in the present petition and the same is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

28.07.2022
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No