Sr. No. 04

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU

OWP No. 1676/2018

Hans Raj and another .....Appellant(s)/Petitioner(s)

Through :- None

v/s

State of J&K and another .....Respondent(s)

Through :- Ms. Nazia Fazal, Assisting counsel vice
Mrs. Monika Kohli, Sr. AAG.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PARIHAR, JUDGE

ORDER
14.08.2026

1. Perusal of the status report filed by the respondents on 14.08.2024 reveals that the case FIR has been investigated and concluded in a charge-sheet, which was filed before the Court of Electricity, Jammu on 29.06.2016 against the accused persons, namely Hans Raj S/o Maan Singh, Ranjeet Singh, Ramesh Singh, Pardeep Singh S/o Hans Raj, all residents of Lower Barnai, Tehsil Jammu North, Jammu, wherein the next date of hearing is fixed on 29.08.2024. This Court, in terms of order dated 31.08.2018, had put the respondents to notice and asked them to show cause as to why the investigation in FIR No. 442/2014 had not been completed. However, as is evident from the compliance report, the said FIR has also culminated in a final police report.

2. Through the medium of the aforesaid petition, the prayer made is that insofar as FIR No. 441/2014 under Sections

447, 147, 148 and 149 RPC, registered at P/S Domana, is concerned, the same already stood concluded by filing of the charge-sheet before the trial Court, but as regards the counter FIR bearing No. 442/2014 under Sections 341 and 323 RPC registered at P/S Domana, the investigation was getting delayed.

3. This Court, in terms of order dated 31.08.2018, had directed the SHO, Police Station Domana, to expedite the investigation in FIR No. 442/2014 and also explain the reasons as to why the investigation has not been completed. Subsequently, the respondents have filed a report that even FIR No. 442/2014 has been closed as *not admitted* vide final report No. 140/2019 dated 25.11.2019 and the closure report has been submitted before the concerned forum.

4. In view of these developments, nothing survives in this writ petition and the petitioners may rebut the closure report by approaching the concerned trial Court.

5. In that background, nothing survives in this petition and the same is ***dismissed,*** leaving it open to the petitioners to explore further remedies in accordance with law.

6. Interim direction(s), if any, shall stand vacated.

(Sanjay Parihar)
Judge

JAMMU
14.08.2026
Diksha