



CRR-449-2022

-1-

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

Serial No.203-A

CRR-449-2022

Decided on:17.11.2025

Mahant Ramesh Nath

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Ms. Kritika, Advocate for
Dr. Deipa Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Matinder Brar, Advocate for
Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate
for respondents no.2 to 4.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J.(ORAL)

The revision petition has been filed challenging the order, dated 11.11.2021, passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak, declining the petitioner's application seeking a direction for lodging of the FIR against the accused and adjourning the case for preliminary evidence to be led by the complainant, petitioner herein.

2. The order records as under:

In the case in hand, perusal of application filed by the complainant makes it clear that it is not the plea of the complainant that full details of the accused are not known to him and the same can be determined only as a result of investigation.



It is also not the plea of the complainant that any recovery is to be effected by conducting raids or searches of suspected places or persons. The complainant in his application has also not pleaded that for the purpose of launching a successful prosecution of the accused, evidence is required to be collected and preserved or recovery of any case property is to be made and kept sealed. The complainant in his application has also not pleaded that any witness is not known to him and has to be found out or discovered through the process of investigation. The complainant alongwith his complaint has submitted his list of witnesses wherein he has cited as many as ten witnesses.

In such circumstances and in view of the aforesaid law laid down by the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court in the case mentioned above, request of the complainant to investigate the case after lodging the FIR against the accused is declined.

The case is adjourned to 10.12.2021 for leading preliminary evidence by the complainant.

3. Learned State counsel contends that despite lapse of about five years, no preliminary evidence could be led by the petitioner before the trial Court, and now the application has been dismissed for want of prosecution vide order dated 26.08.2025.

4. The petitioner had approached learned Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, Rohtak, by filing an application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. seeking direction to the Station House Officer, Police Station IMT Rohtak, to register an FIR on his complaint for commission of offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 294, 295, 323, 379-A, 447, 505, 506 IPC, Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), and 3(1)(u) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989. The prayer for issuing the direction was declined vide impugned order, dated 11.11.2021, and the

**CRR-449-2022****-3-**

case was adjourned for preliminary evidence. Undisputedly, no evidence has been led by the petitioner for all these years, and now the application itself has been dismissed for want of prosecution. Accordingly, the instant petition does not survive.

5. Dismissed.

17.11.2025*Mehak***(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE***Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No**Whether reportable? Yes/No*