IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

Cr. Revision No.74 of 2017
Decided on 08.10.2026

Dinesh Rawat …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. …Respondent

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Chirag Bhanu Singh, Judge.
[1]Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioner: Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate.

For the respondent: Mr. Lokender Kutlehria, Additional Advocate General.

Chirag Bhanu Singh, Judge *(Oral)*

The bailable warrants issued against the petitioner had been received back unserved with the report that he has died. However, the office had reported that there was discrepancy in the parentage of the petitioner, as such this Court, vide an order dated 29.12.2025, had directed the State to verify the same. Since then, the matter has been listed twice.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner however, reiterates that the petitioner had since died and so also is the stand of the learned Additional Advocate General.

3. The perusal of the record is suggestive of the fact that undoubtedly the parentage of the petitioner some how, in the

judgment of the learned trial Court and the learned First Appellate Court was shown, as Dinesh Rawat son of Ragav Rawat. However, the entire record of the learned trial Court conclusively shows that the name of father of the petitioner-Dinesh Rawat was Madhav Rawat. All the documents on record including the driving license of the accused before the learned trial Court shows that his father name was Madhav Rawat. The certified copy of the driving license also shows the same. Over and apart, the statement of the petitioner/accused recorded under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. also shows that his father name has been recorded, as Madhav Rawat.

4. The investigatory record including the memos prepared by the police, including charge sheet shows that the name of the father of the petitioner/accused was Madhav Rawat. It seems that inadvertently the name and parentage of the petitioner came to be wrongly reflected in the judgment of the learned trial Court and the error continued unabated till this Court, and hence the discrepancy.

5. The perusal of the record, thus clearly and categorically shows that the petitioner-Dinesh Rawat was son of Madhav Rawat and as such, the death certificate and the report submitted by the State cannot be doubted, in any manner.

6. In the aforesaid circumstances, the present petition is dismissed as having been abated. Record of the learned trial Court be sent back forthwith.

7. The petition is disposed off accordingly, so also the pending application(s), if any.

(Chirag Bhanu Singh)
Judge

8th October, 2026
(subhash sharma)