

CRR-1979-2023

--1--

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

112

CRR-1979-2023

Date of Decision: September 05, 2023

Narender Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr.Surinder Gandhi, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana

ANOOP CHITKARA J. (ORAL)

Challenging the order of framing of charges dated 06.06.2023 passed by Ld. Additional Sessions Judge, Charkhi Dadri, wherein the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused No.8, has come up before this Court.

2. The allegations against the petitioner are that he alongwith co-accused forged chassis numbers, engine numbers, created forged registration certificates and identification details of stolen vehicles in connivance with the officials of RTA and then they sold them.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was arraigned as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement by one of the main accused- Naresh, who had pointed out petitioner's involvement in the alleged offence. In para 3 and 4 of the petition, the stand taken by the petitioner for quashing of order of framing of charges is that one Naresh Kumar, who was declared as proclaimed offender in complaints filed by him under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, made disclosure statement qua petitioner's involvement. To substantiate his

CRR-1979-2023

--2--

submission, counsel for the petitioner also annexed copy of order as Annexure P-1 and P-2.

4. After going the contents of the petition, if the stand taken by the petitioner is hypothetically taken as true still it would not draw a presumption that the confessional statement made by Naresh Kumar implicating the petitioner, was false. In addition, perusal of the order of framing of charges does not refer to such confessional statement and it show charges were framed based on the investigation conducted and the evidence available on record. I have also gone through the order of framing of charges which is procedurally correct and passed as per requirement of Code of Criminal Procedure.

5. In the entirety of facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner does not make out a case even for issuing notice. Thus, no case for interference is made out and the present petition is dismissed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

September 05, 2023
sonia arora

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