



CRM-M-28174-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

150

**CRM-M-28174-2024 (O&M)
Decided on: 12.03.2026**

RANJIT SINGH**.....Petitioner**

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS**.....Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Adesh Pal Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of order dated 15.05.2024, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Tarn Taran (Annexure P-3), whereby preliminary evidence of the complainant has been closed in case bearing No. COMI-6-2023 dated 10.01.2023 titled as “Ranjit Singh Versus Gurbaj Singh and Others” under Sections 452, 325, 323, 324, 34 of IPC registered at Police Station Chohla Sahib, Distirct Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that vide impugned order, the preliminary evidence of the complainant has been closed in an arbitrary manner without affording any further opportunity, especially when the official witness i.e. Dr. Rasleen Kaur who had examined the petitioner and is prime pillar to establish the case in order to prove the guilt of the accused persons, had not come forward in order

to support the case of the complainant. He thus prayed for quashing of



impugned order and for granting one more opportunity to get examined Dr. Rasleen Kaur for just and proper decision of the case.

3. The nature of the order that this Court is going to pass, no notice is required to be issued to the respondents.

4. Heard and impugned order perused.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the impugned order passed by the learned trial Court, several opportunities had been granted to the complainant to lead his evidence by way of producing witness(es) to the Court but the petitioner failed to do so. The learned trial Court closed complainant evidence after recording reasons and to prevent undue delay in the trial. Exercise of inherent powers is to be exercised with direct caution and only in exceptional circumstances, where a potent illegality, gross miscarriage of justice, or abuse of process of Court is demonstrated. The present case in hand does not disclose any such circumstances warranting interference of inherent jurisdiction of this Court.

6. Keeping in view the above discussion, this Court does not find any merit in the present case. Ergo, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

12.03.2026
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO