

112 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH  
(through video conferencing)

CRR-1734-2021  
Decided on : 06.01.2022

Vinay Batra

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & anr.

..... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present : Mr. R.K.Bagga, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)**

Challenge in the instant petition has been laid to the impugned order dated 25.08.2021 vide which the petitioner was charged under Sections 323, 498-A, 406, 506 IPC and Section 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on a perusal of the allegations levelled in the FIR in question, it is evident that no case for framing of charges under the aforementioned Sections is made out, much less, under Section 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act.

Heard learned counsel and perused the material available on record including the impugned order passed by the Court below.

The prime object of framing a charge is to enable the accused to have a clear idea as to what offence he is being tried for, by the Court and the essential facts, which would have to be addressed by him during trial. The truthfulness or otherwise of the prosecution version would be put to test during trial when the petitioner shall get ample opportunity to test the veracity of the testimony of the prosecution witnesses on the touchstone of cross examination.

This Court does not find any perversity much less illegality in the impugned order as the Court while framing charges is merely to satisfy itself after sifting and weighing the material produced before it by the investigating agency, as to whether a *prima facie* case is made out against the accused or not. Needless to add, the Court cannot be expected to enter into the realm of appreciating the evidence at the stage of framing of charges. The material on record, *prima facie* indicates that offences under Sections 323, 498-A, 406, 506 IPC and Section 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act are made out and hence, this Court is not inclined to exercise its revisional jurisdiction in setting aside the impugned order.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed. However, it is clarified that anything observed hereinabove shall not tantamount to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

06.01.2022

*sonia*

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