

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

**CRR-412-2023**

**DATE OF DECISION:-10.03.2023**

Satish Kumar

...Petitioner.

**Vs.**

Shubham Munjal

...Respondent..

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present: Mr. Kamal Jindal, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)**

By way of present criminal revision petition, challenge has been made to an order dated 12.12.2022 passed by learned JMIC, Dabwali, whereby an application filed at the instance of respondent-complainant for seeking permission to examine his father-Gulshan Kumar as special power of attorney, was allowed.

On 13.02.2023, this Court passed the following order:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that the trial Court while passing the order has misread that the judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **A.C. Narayanan Vs. State of Maharashtra and another**, passed in Criminal Appeal No.73 of 2007 dated 13.09.2013, as the same was not applicable to the facts of the present case, as in the case in hand, the complainant has nowhere mentioned in the entire complaint regarding the knowledge of power of attorney regarding the transaction in question.*

*Notice of motion for 10.03.2023.”*

In pursuance thereof, Mr.P.S. Jammu, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-complainant and submits that the respondent-complainant shall not press for his application seeking

permission to examine his father as special power of attorney, rather, he would appear as his own witness in support of the complaint.

In view thereof, the present petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

10.03.2023  
sonika

**(HARKESH MANUJA)**  
**JUDGE**

whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No  
whether reportable: Yes/No