



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

219

CRR-63-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision : 29.11.2025

Karnail Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab & Ors.

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh Bawa, Amicus Curiae
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aiman Jamal Chishti, AAG Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. This revision petition has been preferred by the complainant/revisionist petitioner, hereinafter being referred to as 'petitioner' only, who has lodged the FIR for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 of Indian Penal Code, i.e. FIR No.60 dated 10.09.2014, Police Station Phul, District Bathinda.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that with regard to abovementioned FIR, the investigation was conducted by the police and after investigation, final report was submitted before the Court of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Phul, hereinafter being referred to as 'trial Court' only, who conducted the trial against two persons, i.e. respondents No.2 and 3. Ultimately, after trial, the learned trial Court arrived at a judgment that charges against them were not proved. Resultantly, by



virtue of judgment dated 23.03.2017, the respondents No.2 and 3 were acquitted.

3. Aggrieved of the abovementioned judgment of acquittal, passed by the learned trial Court, the petitioner preferred an appeal in the Court of Sessions. The abovesaid appeal was decided by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge Bathinda, hereinafter being referred to as 'Appellate Court' only, by virtue of judgment dated 18.11.2022. The learned Appellate Court dismissed the appeal preferred by the petitioner. Hence, the instant petition.

4. Notice of motion qua respondent No.1 only.

5. Ms. Aiman Jamal Chishti, AAG Punjab appears on behalf of respondent No.1-State, and waives service.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended by learned *Amicus Curiae* defending the cause of the petitioner that without any reliable evidence merely on the basis of assumptions and presumptions, the learned trial Court has acquitted the petitioner. The learned *Amicus Curiae* has contended that the evidence led by the prosecution is sufficient and good enough to draw a conclusion that charges against the respondent No.2 stand proved and therefore, there is a need for indulgence and interference by this Court by exercising revisional jurisdiction. According to learned *Amicus Curiae*, the impugned judgments, passed by the learned trial Court as well as learned Appellate Court are



outcome of conjectures and surmises and therefore, both of them deserve to be set aside.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. A perusal of record reveals that the judgment, rendered by the learned Appellate Court, is a well-reasoned judgment passed on proper appreciation of evidence. Thus, there is no scope of interference or indulgence in the findings, returned by the learned Appellate Court. Otherwise also, since learned counsel for the petitioner has not turned up despite service of notice, it is apparent that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the present petition.

10. As a sequel to abovementioned observations, finding no merits it is hereby held that the present petition deserves dismissal. Hence the same is hereby dismissed, accordingly.

11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 29, 2025
Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No