

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

CRR-350-2023 (O&M)
Decided on : 10.02.2023

Akamjit Singh @ Ekamjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. D.S.Sandhu, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramdeep Pratap Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

The petitioner is impugning the order dated 04.01.2023 passed by Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide which he was ordered to face trial as an additional accused along with other accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case in hand. Learned counsel submits that after registration of FIR No.76 dated 03.09.2015 under Sections 308, 325, 323, 341, 294, 148, 149 and 506 IPC, the investigating agency found the petitioner innocent and hence, did not challan him. It was vide order dated 21.11.2019 learned trial Court by wrongly allowing an application moved under Section 319 Cr.PC by the prosecution, summoned the petitioner as an additional accused to face trial along with other accused. While drawing the attention of this Court to the impugned order, learned counsel further submits that the trial Court erred in making corrections qua the father's name of the petitioner, which also point out to his false implication.

Heard learned counsel and perused the relevant material available on record.

The petitioner is impugning the order dated 04.01.2023, which was passed on an application moved by the prosecution for correction of the name of father of the petitioner. It transpires that after application under Section 319 Cr.PC was allowed for summoning the petitioner as an additional accused on 21.11.2019, summons on the petitioner could not be effected and were received back unserved as inadvertently in the application under Section 319 Cr.PC, the name of the father of the petitioner was wrongly mentioned as Gurjit Singh instead of Jagjit Singh on account of clerical error. Vide impugned order, necessary corrections were carried out. This Court, thus, does not find any ground much less cogent reason to set aside the impugned order as it was on account of a clerical error that the name of the father of the petitioner had been wrongly mentioned as Gurjit Singh instead of Jagjit Singh.

Accordingly, the present petitioner being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

10.02.2023
sonia

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