

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

111

CWP-5738-2024

Date of decision: 12.03.2024

ASHWANI SOOD

...PETITIONER

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Tarun Deora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent No. 2-SSP Khanna to cancel police verification report dated 02.11.2023.
2. The respondent No. 6 has applied for passport. On the direction of passport authority, the respondent No. 5 conducted police verification and forwarded its report dated 02.11.2023 disclosing that petitioner has already been discharged in FIR No. 31 dated 29.03.2017 under Sections 323, 325, 452, 379-B, 411, 427, 148, 149 IPC registered at Police Station Bhadson, District Patiala.
3. Mr. Tarun Deora, Advocate submits that police verification report is contrary to judicial record. The respondent No. 6 has not been discharged whereas matter before the trial Court is fixed for framing charges.
4. Notice of motion.
5. Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab, who on advance notice is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

6.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Shivoy Dhir, Senior Panel Counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent-Union of India.
7.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab confirms the afore-stated factual position.
8.

From the perusal of PVR and Zimni orders of trial Court coupled with statement of State counsel, it prima facie appears that police official has made a mistake while preparing PVR. Thus, the Regional Passport Officer, Chandigarh is hereby requested to consider, while processing application seeking passport, the fact that respondent No. 6 has not till date been discharged in the aforesaid FIR
9.

Disposed of.

12.03.2024
anju

[JAGMOHAN BANSAL]
JUDGE

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