



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

105

1.

CRA-D No.823-DB of 2005
Date of decision: August 8th, 2025

Bikram Singh

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Appellant

.....Respondents
2.

Criminal Revision No.2292 of 2005

Gurdev Singh

Versus

Bikram Singh

.....Petitioner

.....Respondent
3.

Criminal Revision No.1204 of 2006

Gurdev Singh

Versus

Jatinder Singh and others

.....Petitioner

.....Respondents
4.

CRM-A No.130-MA of 2006

State of Punjab

Versus

Jatinder Singh @ Lucky and others

.....Applicant

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**

Present: Mr. R.S. Cheema, Senior Advocate
with Mr. S.S. Kang, Advocate
for the appellant (in CRA-D No.823-DB of 2005).

Ms. Anju Sharma, Advocate (through V.C.)
for the petitioner/complainant
(in CRR-2292-2005 and CRR-1204-2006).

Mr. H.S. Deol, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab,
for the applicant (in CRM-A No.130-MA of 2006).

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

By this order, we propose to dispose of the above-mentioned appeal, two Criminal Revision Petitions as well as the application filed by the State for grant of leave to appeal, as they pertain to the same occurrence.

2. The appeal i.e. CRA-D No.823-DB of 2005 is directed against the judgment dated 18.10.2005 and order of sentence dated 22.10.2025 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, whereby the appellant-Bikram Singh, was convicted under Section 302 of the IPC and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life with a fine of ₹2,000/-, while his co-accused Jatinder Singh alias Lucky, Manjit Singh alias Shuka and Avtar Singh were acquitted. Accused Jagmohan Singh expired during trial, and accused Baljinder Singh alias Billa was declared a proclaimed offender.

3. The revision petition i.e. CRR No.2292 of 2005 has been filed with a prayer that conviction and sentence awarded upon Bikram Singh be maintained and the amount of fine be enhanced, whereas CRR No.1204 of 2006 and CRM-A-130-MA-2006 have been preferred by the complainant and State of Punjab respectively, challenging the judgment of acquittal dated 18.10.2005 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, whereby the accused-respondents Jatinder Singh alias Lucky, Manjit Singh alias Shuka and Avtar Singh were acquitted of the charges framed against them.

CASE OF THE PROSECUTION:

4. The case of the prosecution, in essence, originates from the statement of Jagmohan Singh (since expired during trial) recorded on 24.02.2003 by Sub Inspector Surinder Singh. This statement (Exhibit PH)

formed the basis for the registration of FIR (Exhibit PH/2).

5. As per the version so set forth, Jagmohan Singh, owner-cum-driver of Tata Sumo vehicle bearing registration No.HR29-G-4666, had on 23.02.2003, along with Kashmir Singh (driver) transported the marriage party of Jaswinder Singh son of Avtar Singh, from Village Reru to Vindsor Palace, Phagwara. The marriage party included two persons, who were carrying 12 bore guns with them.

6. During the celebrations, Baljinder Singh son of Avtar Singh, Romi son of Jinder Arora, Satinderpal son of Charanjit Singh, and Manjit Singh alias Shuka were seen exchanging the guns and firing shots in a jubilant mood. Avtar Singh (father of the groom) openly encouraged the firing, telling them that on such a joyous occasion they could fire as much as they pleased.

7. At about 5:30 pm, as the *baraat* was departing from Vindsor Palace, Manjit Singh alias Shuka was allegedly holding one such firearm. By that time, most members of the marriage party had departed, leaving behind only a few persons including Appellant-Bikram Singh (son of Sakattar Singh), also known as *President*, Jatinder Singh alias Lucky and some relatives from the bride's side.

8. Allegedly, Manjit Singh alias Shuka aimed the firearm at Mohan Singh and fired, hitting him on the right side of the abdomen, causing him to collapse. Thereafter, Bikram Singh (appellant herein), Jatinder Singh alias Lucky, and Manjit Singh alias Shuka, after handing over the firearm to someone else, approached the fallen Mohan Singh, lifted him and placed him in a vehicle. At the instance of appellant-Bikram Singh, injured Mohan Singh was rushed to Janta Hospital, Jalandhar. While being

administered first aid, Mohan Singh (hereinafter referred to as 'deceased') succumbed to his injuries. Appellant-Bikram Singh then allegedly instructed Jagmohan Singh and others to take the body of the deceased to his residence.

9. The dead body of the deceased was taken to Village Raipur Rasulpur in a tempo traveller and handed over to his family members. Subsequently, Jagmohan Singh accompanied by Rajinder Nagra (Circle Jathedar, Jalandhar), Kapil Dev (Ex-Sarpanch), Darbara Singh (Sarpanch), and Master Gyan Singh (resident of Raipur Rasulpur), proceeded to lodge the report. On the way, at Paper Chowk, Phagwara, they met SI Surinder Singh, to whom the incident was narrated, leading to the registration of the FIR. The special report (Exhibit PN/3) reached the learned Illaqa Magistrate at about 4:00 pm on 24.02.2023.

10. Sub Inspector Surinder Singh accompanied the complainant party to Raipur Rasulpur, where the dead body of the deceased lay in the house of his father, Gurdev Singh. The inquest report (Exhibit PJ) was prepared, with the body identified by Balbir Singh and Kuldeep Singh. The body was sent to Civil Hospital, Phagwara, for post-mortem. The accused was searched, but none could be traced that day.

11. On 24.02.2003, Head Constable Davinder Singh, Constable-II Manjit Singh and Constable Daya Ram produced the Post-Mortem Report (Exhibit PB/1), before Sub Inspector Surinder Singh along with sealed clothes of the deceased and a sealed plastic box containing pellets recovered during the autopsy, which were taken into possession by the recovery memo, (Exhibit P-D).

12. On 24.02.2003, PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh, Dhyan Singh, and PW-2 Gurudev Singh met the Investigating Officer at Chehal Chowk,

Phagwara, and their statements were recorded. Sukhwinder Singh narrated that on the day of the incident, he and Dhyan Singh had gone to the house of Gurdev Singh to meet deceased, but were informed that deceased had gone to a wedding in Rehru. They traced the marriage party to Vindsor Palace, Phagwara, and entered the venue around 5:00/5:15 pm. They saw a car ready for the bride and the groom's departure. Manjit Singh alias Shuka was firing shots in front of the car. Appellant-Bikram Singh then allegedly took the firearm from Manjit Singh alias Shuka, pointed it towards the abdomen of the deceased, and fired. When Sukhwinder Singh and Dhyan Singh tried to assist, they were told by appellant-Bikram Singh, Jagmohan Singh, Jatinder Singh and Manjit Singh to stand aside as they would “take care” of the deceased. The accused then took deceased in a Tata Sumo towards Jalandhar. Later, they found no trace of the deceased at Civil Hospital, Phagwara, and learnt on returning to Raipur Rasulpur that he had died.

13. Spot inspection was carried out, and site plan (Exhibit PK) was prepared. Gurdev Singh produced a coat belonged to the deceased, which was sealed and taken into possession by the memo Exhibit PL.

14. On 25.02.2003, Balbir Singh and Sukhwinder Singh produced a video film and photographs of the marriage function (Exhibit PF). Statements of witnesses were recorded on 26.02.2003. On 27.02.2003, Darbar Singh, Ex-Sarpanch, Kapil Dev, and Master Gyan Singh made their respective statements.

15. On 01.03.2003, Inspector Manjit Singh, the then SHO, added the offence under Section 302 of the IPC, recorded statements of venue owner Jogesh Sardana and Manager Jagjit Lal. On 25.03.2003, the investigation was entrusted to DSP Chaman Lal, who, after examining the

material, found appellant-Bikram Singh, Manjit Singh alias Shuka, Jatinder Singh alias Lucky, Avtar Singh and Baljinder Singh (proclaimed offender) involved in the crime in question. Appellant-Manjit Singh alias Shukha was arrested on 05.05.2003, and Section 201 of the IPC was added. Prior to this, Avtar Singh was arrested on 28.02.2003 and Jatinder Singh and Jagmohan Singh were arrested on 01.03.2003. On 17.05.2003, appellant-Bikram Singh surrendered in the Court of learned JMIC, Phagwara and was arrested upon an application moved by the prosecution. He subsequently produced the firearm before the Magistrate.

16. Upon conclusion of the investigation, final report under Section 173 of the Cr.P.C. was presented before the competent Court.

17. The case was committed to the Court of Sessions, where charges were framed under Section 120B of the IPC (against all accused), Section 302 of the IPC (against appellant-Bikram Singh), Section 302-114 of the IPC (against Jagmohan Singh, Jatinder Singh alias Lucky, Manjit Singh alias Shuka, and Avtar Singh), and in the alternative, Section 302/120B of the IPC. Appellant-Bikram Singh was also charged under Section 201 IPC. All the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

18. The prosecution, in order to substantiate its case, examined 23 witnesses including some eyewitnesses, doctors, recovery witnesses, Investigating Officers and formal witnesses.

19. Dr. Gurdit Singh (PW-1), along with Dr. Baldev Raj and Dr. Rajiv Gupta conducted the post-mortem on 24.02.2003 at 3:10 pm, finding a single firearm entry wound on the lower right abdomen, with internal damage to intestines, major vessels, and extensive retroperitoneal hematoma, Multiple metallic pellets and a red plastic piece were recovered.

Death was opined to be due to hemorrhage and shock consequent to firearm injury, sufficient in the ordinary course of nature to cause death.

20. Dr. Mohit Sharma (PW-3) deposed that deceased was brought to Janta Hospital, Jalandhar, by 3-4 persons but was found dead upon examination.

21. In addition, certain key prosecution witnesses like PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh corroborated his earlier statement to police and identified appellant-Bikram Singh as the shooter.

22. PW-2 Gurdev Singh, father of the deceased, deposed that PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh informed him that appellant-Bikram Singh had fired the fatal shot.

23. PW-5 Ashok Kumar testified qua the motive, referring to a quarrel between the accused and the deceased two days prior to the occurrence allegedly over money and vehicle finance.

24. PW-10 Iqbal Singh stated that on 23.02.2003, he overheard Jagmohan Singh, Jatinder Singh and Manjit Singh alias Shuka discussing how appellant-Bikram Singh wanted deceased to be brought to the wedding in order to take revenge for an earlier altercation.

25. PW-12 Gian Singh deposed that Jagmohan Singh and Jatinder Singh allegedly made an extrajudicial confession to him on 27.02.2003, regarding appellant-Bikram Singh's role in the occurrence in question.

26. PW-6 Paramjit Singh prepared the scaled site plan (Exhibit PC) and PW-7 Baljit Singh and PW-8 Kuldip Singh provided video recordings and photographs of the marriage function. Other prosecution witnesses were also examined, however, they were formal in nature; their testimonies were

consistent in proving that the seals on the various case properties remained intact and the exhibits were untampered.

27. The prosecution tendered the FSL report (Exhibit PS) and gave up certain witnesses as unnecessary or won over by the accused. Thereafter, the prosecution closed its evidence.

28. The accused, in their statements recorded under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C., denied the allegations, alleging false implication. Appellant-Bikram Singh pleaded innocence, relying on an inquiry by SP Harmanbir Singh which allegedly exonerated him. Accused Jitinder Singh alias Lucky denied his presence at the scene. Accused Avtar Singh claimed that his son's wedding had concluded peacefully without any incident. Accused-Manjit Singh alias Shuka alleged false implication on account of village factionalism.

29. The defence examined DW-1 Harmanbir Singh Gill, SP, who deposed that he had inquired into the matter based on an application (Exhibit DW-1/A) from Parminder Kaur. Only one party attended the inquiry. He recorded statements of some attendees from both the side of the bride as well as the groom and concluded vide report Exhibit DW-1/B that Bikram Singh had been falsely implicated.

30. On the basis of the evidence led, the learned trial Court acquitted all the accused except appellant-Bikram Singh, against whom conviction was recorded by the impugned judgment dated 18.10.2005.

SUBMISSIONS BY LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE APPELLANT:

31. Learned senior counsel for the appellant, assailing the judgment of conviction recorded by the learned trial Court, submitted that the case of

the prosecution suffers from fundamental infirmities which go to the root of the matter. It was urged that the earliest version of the incident, as emerging from the statement of Jagmohan Singh (who was later nominated as an accused and subsequently died during trial), is of decisive importance. In this statement (Exhibit PH), there was not even a passing reference to the appellant-Bikram Singh. On the contrary, Jagmohan Singh categorically stated that it was Manjit Singh alias Shuka alone who had fired the shot during the wedding celebrations at the time when the bride and the bridegroom were about to depart. This original account, according to the learned senior counsel, represents the most spontaneous and, therefore, the most credible version of the occurrence.

32. It was also further emphasized by the learned senior counsel that this omission assumes far greater significance when considered in the light of the unexplained delay in registration of the FIR. The occurrence allegedly took place at about 5:30 pm on 23.02.2003, yet the FIR (Exhibit PH/2) came to be registered only at 1:00 pm, on the following day, 24.02.2003. During his deposition, PW-2 Gurudev Singh, father of the deceased, admitted that by 8:00 pm on 23.02.2003, he had already come to know of both the death of his son and the identity of the assailant, who had fired at him. In such circumstances, learned senior counsel contended, it is wholly unnatural and inconsistent with normal human conduct for a father, who is aware of the culprit responsible for his son's death, to remain inactive and not report the matter to the police forthwith. This silence till the next afternoon, without even attempting to inform the police, is inexplicable and casts a grave shadow of doubt over the veracity of the prosecution version. Such an inordinate and suspicious delay, it was urged, points unmistakably

to a concocted and embellished narrative being introduced later.

33. It was still further submitted by the learned senior counsel for the appellant that, according to the prosecution itself, the police had taken possession of the body of the deceased from his residence during the night of 23.02.2003. However, both PW-15 Sub Inspector Surinder Singh and PW-9 Head Constable Davinder Singh stated that the inquest proceedings were conducted only at 12 noon on 24.02.2003, at the residence of the deceased, in the presence of PW-2 Gurdev Singh and PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh. At that time, there was no objection from either witness to the initial version given by Jagmohan Singh. This, according to the learned senior counsel, undermines the later improvements and alterations in the case of the prosecution.

34. Drawing the attention of this Court to Exhibit PH (statement of Jagmohan Singh) and Exhibit PJ (inquest report), learned senior counsel submitted that in both these prior versions, the firing was attributed exclusively to Manjit Singh alias Shuka. The name of the appellant surfaced only in later statements. The contradictions between the initial and subsequent versions, coupled with unnatural and abnormal conduct of the key witnesses, clearly demonstrate that the first version was suppressed to make way for a later, tailored account.

35. With regard to PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh, learned senior counsel characterized him as a planted witness whose so called “chance presence” at the time of the occurrence was inherently doubtful. Though PW-4, Sukhwinder Singh, a close relative of the deceased, claimed to have personally witnessed the shooting, his conduct was wholly unnatural. Instead of immediately informing the family of the deceased or

accompanying the injured to the hospital, he claims to have returned to the house of the deceased. His cross-examination further exposed improbabilities in terms of timing and distances, and significantly, he admitted that he did not even know the accused prior to the incident. No test identification parade was ever held. In such circumstances, learned senior counsel argued that conviction based solely on dock identification was, wholly unsafe.

36. Learned senior counsel for the appellant further contended that PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh made material and damaging improvements during trial which fatally undermined his credibility. In his earliest statement recorded under Section 161 of the Cr.P.C., he did not attribute any role to the appellant. However, in his deposition before the Court, he introduced new allegations including a purported conspiracy and a claim that the appellant had instructed that the deceased be taken to Jalandhar Hospital. Such afterthoughts, learned senior counsel submitted, are plainly the product of embellishment and cannot be relied upon.

37. Turning to the forensic evidence, learned senior counsel argued that the FSL report did not connect the weapon with the fatal injury. The FSL report merely stated that the gun had been fired at some unspecified specified time, without any ballistic linkage between the weapon and the pellets or wads recovered from the body. The prosecution made no effort to match the recovered material with the alleged weapon of offence. Further, as per the learned senior counsel, the weapon was found to be unsealed when received from the *Malkhana*, thereby compromising its evidentiary integrity. In such a scenario, reliance on this report to implicate the appellant, as per the learned senior counsel, was wholly misplaced.

38. Lastly, it was vehemently argued that the acceptance by the trial Court of the motive theory projected by the prosecution, despite disbelieving certain material aspects of the case, did not justify conviction. The alleged occurrence took place at a wedding function where numerous guests were present, yet not a single independent witness was examined. Only witnesses related to or connected with the deceased were produced, who, as per the learned senior counsel, were clearly introduced to bolster a weak case. Convicting the appellant on such tainted evidence amounted to conviction on suspicion rather than proof beyond reasonable doubt.

39. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing for the State supported the impugned judgment. He urged that in the aftermath of a sudden and tragic loss of a young life, it is neither unnatural nor uncommon for the immediate family to be in a state of deep shock and grief. Such emotional trauma can explain the delay in lodging the FIR, and, therefore, the same should not be treated as fatal to the case of the prosecution.

40. Learned State counsel further contended that in criminal cases, particularly those involving fatal assaults, it is often difficult to secure the testimony of independent public witnesses, as many are reluctant to come forward or have their statements recorded for fear of involvement. The absence of such witnesses, therefore, as per the learned State counsel, cannot by itself discredit the prosecution case when other reliable evidence is available.

41. With regard to PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh, learned State counsel submitted that, although, he was connected to the deceased, his testimony could not be discarded merely on that ground. His presence at the scene was entirely natural, as he had travelled to Phagwara specifically to meet the

deceased and thus, happened to be present when the shooting took place. His account was duly corroborated by circumstantial evidence, including photographs of the wedding celebrations in which the appellant was clearly visible. There was, learned counsel submitted, no prior enmity between PW-4 and the appellant to suggest a motive for false implication.

42. Regarding the forensic evidence, it was submitted that the FSL report proved that the weapon surrendered by the appellant had been used for firing. The fact that the appellant himself surrendered the very same weapon provided strong circumstantial evidence of his consciousness of guilt. When read in conjunction with the ocular evidence, the ballistic report lent credible support to the case of the prosecution that the appellant was the actual shooter.

43. Having considered the rival submissions, perused the evidence on record, and scrutinized the reasoning of the learned trial Court in the light of settled legal principles, we are of the considered view that the conviction of appellant-Bikram Singh is not sustainable. The prosecution evidence, when examined cumulatively, reveals material contradictions, improbable conduct, and serious lapses in the investigation which create a compelling doubt. Such doubt, in terms of criminal jurisprudence, must enure to the benefit of the accused-appellant. The reasons are set out hereunder:

(i) Delay in lodging the FIR and the earliest version exonerating the appellant:

(a) The occurrence, as per the prosecution, took place at about 5:30 pm on 23.02.2003. PW-2 Gurdev Singh, father of the deceased, during trial admitted that by 8:00 pm on the same day, he knew not only of his son's death but also the identity of the alleged shooter. Yet, strangely, the FIR was

registered only at 1:00 pm, the next day i.e. 24.02.2003- after a significant delay of about 17 hours-without any credible explanation.

(b) The argument and explanation by the learned State counsel that PW-2 Gurdev Singh was in a state of shock is too general and unsubstantiated to dispel the doubt such delay creates. Unexplained delay, like the one in the present case, in lodging the FIR gives rise to suspicion of embellishment and afterthought, particularly where a new accused is introduced later. In the present case, the earliest statement, (Exhibit PH), attributed the firing solely to Manjit Singh alias Shuka, with no mention of the appellant. This version is identically reflected in the inquest report, Exhibit PJ.

(c) While an FIR need not be an encyclopedia, omission of the name of a person later projected as a principal accused, without cogent explanation, is a serious infirmity. The belated introduction of the name of the appellant, in the backdrop of unexplained delay, materially undermines the case of the prosecution.

(ii) Testimony and conduct of PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh:

(a) PW4 Sukhwinder Singh, projected as an eyewitness, claimed to have reached the spot by chance and witnessed the fatal shot. However, his conduct thereafter is wholly unnatural, more so when he claims to be well acquainted and closely related to the deceased. This witness did not raise any alarm, nor did he inform the police, nor did he accompany the injured to hospital at Jalandhar, much less, inform the family-this conduct is inconsistent with that of a natural witness.

(b) More significantly, PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh admitted during his cross-examination that he did not even know the appellant before the

incident. No test identification parade was held to verify his capacity to identify the appellant. His identification in Court thus amounts to mere dock identification, which in the facts and circumstances of the present case, is an inherently weak form of evidence and cannot be the sole basis of conviction.

(c) This witness also made material improvements while deposing as PW-4. In his statement under Section 161 of the Cr.P.C. (Exhibit DB), he did not attribute any role to the appellant. At trial, he introduced allegations of conspiracy and an instruction from the appellant to take the deceased to Jalandhar Hospital. Such improvements erode the substratum of the case of the prosecution and render the testimony unreliable unless corroborated by independent evidence-which is absent here.

(iii) Abnormal conduct of PW-2 Gurdev Singh, father of the deceased:

(a) The behaviour of PW-2 Gurdev Singh is also inconsistent with that of a natural witness. Despite having knowledge of the identity of the alleged assailant on the night of the incident itself, PW-2 Gurdev Singh neither informed the police nor made any immediate statement implicating the appellant. His silence at the inquest proceedings, when the earliest statement was recorded in his presence, further compounds the suspicion. Such abnormal behaviour on the part of a close relative shakes the credibility of the account. Here, the passivity of PW-2 Gurdev Singh, followed by later implication of the appellant, appears to fit a *post facto* narrative rather than an immediate reaction to the incident.

(iv) Forensic evidence: inconclusive and compromised:

(a) The FSL report merely confirms that the firearm allegedly surrendered by the appellant had been fired at some time. No ballistic

linkage was established between the recovered pellets/wads and the said weapon. Compounding the infirmity, the weapon was received from the *Malkhana* in an unsealed condition, fatally compromising the chain of custody. Inconclusive forensic results, therefore, cannot be invoked to fill gaps in a doubtful ocular account. In the present case, the forensic evidence is neutral at best and incapable of corroborating the version of the prosecution.

(v) Absence of independent witnesses and motive:

(a) The incident allegedly occurred at a wedding-a public gathering, where, independent witnesses would naturally be available. Yet, the prosecution examined only related witnesses and particularly PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh, who as already observed earlier, is a highly suspicious and doubtful witness to the occurrence in question. While law does not mandate independent witnesses in all cases, their absence assumes significance where the witnesses examined are interested and their testimony suffers from contradictions, like in the present case.

(b) Additionally, the prosecution failed miserably to attribute any credible motive to the appellant to carry out the crime in question. No doubt, in cases of ocular testimony, motive is not essential where there is clear and cogent evidence, it however, becomes material when the evidence of the prosecution is otherwise weak or unreliable

(vi) Lapses in investigation:

The investigation in the present case was marred by following serious lapses:

- no test identification parade was conducted;
- the scene of occurrence was not scientifically secured;

- crucial recoveries were either not made promptly or were compromised in custody.

44. Such perfunctory investigation that prejudices the accused obliges a Court to approach the case of the prosecution with caution.

45. When the above factors are assessed cumulatively-the unexplained delay in FIR, the earliest version exonerating the appellant, the unreliable and improved testimony of PW-4 Sukhwinder Singh, the abnormal conduct of PW-2 Gurdev Singh, the inconclusive and tainted forensic evidence, the absence of independent witnesses and motive, and the investigative lapses-the case of the prosecution fails to meet the standard of proof beyond reasonable doubt.

46. It is trite law, that the chain of circumstances must be complete and incapable of explanation on any other hypothesis except the guilt of the accused. In this case, not only is the chain incomplete, but several of its links are missing or broken.

47. The presumption of innocence, the golden thread running through criminal jurisprudence, mandates that the benefit of such reasonable doubt must go to the accused.

48. In light of the foregoing discussion, we are of the firm view that the conviction recorded by the learned trial Court against the appellant-Bikram Singh is unsafe and cannot be sustained. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed and the appellant is acquitted of the charges framed against him.

49. Coming next to the CRR No.2292 of 2005 filed by the complainant for enhancing the fine, CRR No.1204 of 2006 (filed by the complainant) and CRM-A No.130-MA of 2006 (filed by the State) for

setting aside the acquittal of the accused/respondents-Jatinder Singh @ Lucky, Manjit Singh @ Shuka and Avtar Singh, this Court finds no merit in these petitions as well as the application for grant of leave to appeal and is not inclined to accept them in view of the above discussion. The learned trial Court has passed a well-reasoned order and acquitted respondents-Jatinder Singh @ Lucky, Manjit Singh @ Shuka and Avtar Singh. The impugned judgment does not warrant interference by this Court. Consequently, the revision petitions filed by the complainant and the application filed by the State for grant of leave to appeal are also dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

August 8th, 2025
Puneet

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	Yes