



CRM-M-38721-2018

-1-

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

CRM-M-38721-2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 17.02.2026

Ranbir Singh and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Ms. Mansi Majoka, Advocate for
Mr. Bhisham Kumar Majoka, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in the present petition is for setting aside complaint No.295 dated 10.09.2015 filed by respondent No.2 against the petitioners under Sections 323, 379, 392, 426, 452, 506, 120-B, 34 IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and also setting aside the order dated 21.07.2018 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, vide which a well reasoned order dated 23.03.2017 passed by learned JMIC, Faridabad, has been set aside and learned JMIC, Faridabad, has been directed to restore the said criminal complaint to its original number.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have been falsely prosecuted in the complaint No.295 dated 10.09.2015. He submits that after due appreciation, learned JMIC, Faridabad finding no merit in the complaint filed by respondent No.2, dismissed the same vide order dated 23.03.2017. He submits that aggrieved by the said



CRM-M-38721-2018

-2-

order, respondent No. 2 preferred a revision petition before learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, who allowed the same and remanded the matter to learned JMIC with a direction to restore the complaint and proceed further in accordance with law. He submits that the limited grievance raised by the petitioners before this Court is that the observations made by the Revisional Court directing the Magistrate to proceed against the petitioners may be construed as a mandate to summon them again. He, thus, submits that the petitioners would be satisfied if the impugned order is clarified to the effect that the Magistrate shall reconsider the complaint independently and without being influenced by any observations made by the Revisional Court.

3. Heard. This Court finds the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners to be genuine. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 21.07.2018 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge is clarified to the extent that while restoring the complaint to its original number, the learned Magistrate shall proceed in accordance with law and decide the matter afresh, independently and uninfluenced by any observations made by the Revisional Court. The complaint shall be decided after affording due opportunity of hearing to both sides.

4. The present petition is accordingly disposed of in the aforesaid terms. Consequently, any pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

17.02.2026
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No