



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

125

CRM-M-46833-2024

Date of decision: October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Karanveer Singh @ Raja

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.**

Prayer in the instant petition is for quashing of FIR No.72 dated 07.07.2024 under Sections 115(2), 127(4), 140(3), 351(3), 318(4), 61(2) of the BNS registered at Police Station Badhni Kalan, District Molga, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. At the outset, a query has been put to the learned counsel with respect to the stage of trial, to which it has been submitted that the matter is still under investigation. However, while placing reliance on an affidavit dated 29.08.2024 of Kartar Singh annexed as Annexure P-2, learned counsel submits that the false implication of the petitioner in the case at hand finds credence from the fact that Kartar Singh, owner of the De-addiction Centre, has categorically stated therein that the petitioner is not an employee of his De-addiction Centre.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case for allegedly assaulting the complainant after confining him in a De-addiction Centre.

***CRM-M-46833-2024******-2-***

4. While drawing the attention of this Court to the FIR in question, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1, it has been submitted by the learned counsel that on a perusal of the FIR, it is evident that the prime allegations levelled qua the running of a De-addiction Centre are against the co-accused; the petitioner is in fact a victim himself, who was admitted by his family in the De-addiction Centre. Learned counsel submits the petitioner is neither the owner nor of the said De-addiction Centre nor in any manner connected with it.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

6. It needs to be reiterated that the matter, as not disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner, is still under investigation and at this nascent stage, it would not be appropriate for this Court to exercise its powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS). Even otherwise, the petitioner in the instant case has raised several disputed questions of fact, which can only be addressed during the course of trial if and when the challan is presented against them. The Court cannot examine the truthfulness of the allegations nor consider the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner regarding his false implication at this nascent stage.

7. In the aforementioned facts and circumstances, no ground is made out to accept the prayer of the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.



9.           However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2024**  
*Puneet*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned       :

Whether reportable                 :

Yes

No