

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

202

CRM-M-6028-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 26.04.2023

Ashok Sachdeva Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present Mr. Vikram Chaudhri, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Parvez Chaudhary, Advocate and
Ms. Hargun Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Virat Rana, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate for the applicant in CRM-22590-2021.

Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate for
Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate for respondents No. 3 and 4.

Mr. Rajiv Malhotra, Advocate for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (ORAL)

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
11	18.01.2021	Raja Sansi, Amritsar	406, 420, 120-B IPC

CRM-22594-2021

This is an application for impleading applicant- Varun Kumar Sachdeva as respondent in this case.

In view of the contents and prayer clause of the application, the same is allowed. Applicant-Varun Kumar Sachdeva is impleaded as respondent.

Amended memo of parties is taken on record.

CRM-M-6028-2021 (O&M)

Short reply dated 25.04.2023 filed by State counsel today in the Court is taken on record.

2. Vide order dated 12.10.2021, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court had granted interim relief to the petitioner subject to compliance of orders mentioned therein.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that all the conditions have been complied with and even the assets have been declared.

4. However, on the contrary the arguments on behalf of contesting respondents/complainant are that assets were wrongly declared and petitioner has put himself liable to be proceeded for perjury. A separate application in this regard has already been filed.

5. On this, Mr. Vikram Chaudhri, Senior Advocate on instructions submits that whatever assets the petitioner had, have already been declared and in case, the contesting respondents come across any other assets which have not been declared, in that eventuality, the petitioner shall certainly be liable for perjury. Simply because the assets declared are less than the anticipation of the contesting respondents, it would not imply that the assets were not rightly declared.

6. Be that as it may, the petitioner, who is aged 73 years and is stated to be suffering him old age ailments like diabetic, bye pass surgery and connected issues, there is no allegations that he tried to influence the witness in further investigation of the case.

7. Given above, the present petition is allowed and interim order dated 12.10.2021 is made absolute. All pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of. CRM-34481-2022 stands disposed of with liberty to file fresh petition, if need arises.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

26.04.2023
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No