



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

121

CRM-M-48460-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.02.2026

Karamjeet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Krishan Singh, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for quashing the impugned order dated 08.08.2025 passed by learned Special Judge, Ludhiana in case bearing No.PC-08-2023 in FIR No.02 dated 23.02.2023, under Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, registered at Police Station Economic Offences Wing, Punjab, Vigilance Bureau, Ludhiana, whereby petitioner was directed to provide his voice samples in an application filed under Section 311-A read with Section 311 of CrPC.

2. Learned counsel submits that since the investigating agency, during the course of the enquiry, did not obtain voice samples of the petitioner, the trial Court ought not to have allowed the application filed by the prosecution to fill up lacunae and directed him to do so.



3. Learned State counsel on the other hand states that there is an audio recording between the accused and the petitioner and the former has already given his voice samples, while that of the latter are also imperative to be obtained to complete the chain.

4. Heard.

5. It is significant to note that the petitioner himself is the complainant who had approached the Economic Offences Wing, Punjab, Vigilance Bureau, Ludhiana, alleging demand of illegal gratification in relation to the partition of his land. In support whereof, he had produced a compact disc containing the recorded conversation with the accused, duly accompanied by a Certificate under Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. It was in these circumstances, where the authenticity of a document produced by the complainant himself came under cloud owing to him having resiled from his statement, that an application seeking a voice sample was preferred, leading to the passing of the impugned order. The direction so issued is, therefore, contextual and necessitated by his subsequent conduct, aimed solely at enabling the Court to verify the genuineness of the material already on record and to arrive at the truth.

6. It is well-settled that procedure is handmaiden of justice and must be invoked to facilitate a fair and complete adjudication. The direction to furnish a voice sample, in the present case, does not seek to artificially strengthen the prosecution case or cure inherent defects therein, instead, it serves the limited and legitimate purpose of enabling the Court to verify the authenticity of a document already on record. This process of verification



cannot in any way be construed as a means of bridging the gap.

7. On the anvil of the afore, this Court finds no error, legal or factual, in the impugned order dated 08.08.2025, warranting any interference. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

18.02.2026
M.Kamra

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No