



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

263-2

CRM-M-22317-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 26.03.2025

SUDESH RANI

....Petitioner

Versus

ANJALI SHARMA @ ASHU

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present : Ms. Kudrat Sareen, Advocate for
Mr. Sarju Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. N.S. Lucky, Advocate for the respondent.

KIRTI SINGH. J.(Oral)

1. *Per contra*, learned Counsel for the respondent contends that in the FIR filed by the petitioner against the respondent and her parents, the mother of the respondent passed away during the course of trial while the respondent was declared innocent by the investigating agency. However, the respondent was later summoned in the said FIR vide order dated 29.10.2014, on an application filed by the petitioner under section 319 Cr.P.C., but the said summoning order was set aside in revision vide impugned order dated 20.01.2015, which subsequently attained finality. However, the petitioner, by concealing the fact that the petitioner had also filed the aforesaid FIR in which the summoning order of the respondent had been set side aside, filed the instant complaint against the respondent by levelling similar allegations as that in the previous FIR. Learned counsel contends that this patent illegality was pointed out by the revisional court while discharging the respondent. The impugned order of the revisional court is a well reasoned order based on the correct proposition of law, and thus deserves to be upheld.

2. After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner concedes to the submissions made by learned counsel for the respondent and does not press the present petition.

- 3. Resultantly, the petition is dismissed as not pressed.
- 4. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

26.03.2025
amandeep

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No