

**IN THE COURT OF MS. MANPREET KAUR, PCS,
JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE IST CLASS, RUPNAGAR**

CNR No. PBRO03000550-2017

CIS No. CHI-127-2017

Date of Filing: 28.03.2017

Date of Decision: 20.04.2022

State	Versus	1.	Gurpreet Singh son of Sukhpreet Singh, resident of Village Gharuan, District SAS Nagar, Mohali.
		2.	Sukhdeep Singh @ Malli son of Nirmal Singh, resident of village Amrali, Police Station Morinda, District Rupnagar.
			...Accused.
			FIR No.44 dated 19.03.2016
			Under Sections:- 341, 427, 506, 34 IPC.
			Police Station: Morinda.

Present: Sh. Raman Gill, Ld. APP for the State.
Accused Gurpreet Singh on bail with counsel Sh. Sahib Singh Khurl Advocate.
Accused Sukhdeep Singh acquitted vide Judgment dated 08.11.2019.

JUDGMENT

1. The above-named accused Gurpreet Singh has been forwarded by the Station House Officer, Police Stations Morinda, for facing trial for offence punishable under Section 341, 427, 506, 34 of Indian Penal Code.

BRIEF FACTS

2. In brief, the case of prosecution, as emanates from the final report under section 173 of Cr.P.C and documents appended therewith, is that on 19.03.2016, ASI Hakam Singh (*hereinafter-referred-to-as-IO*) alongwith other police officials has been present at Kainour Chowk, where complainant Jagpreet Singh, son of Sarabjit Singh, resident of

Ward No.3 Morinda alongwith his brother Jaspreet Singh, has met him and has got recorded his statement to the effect that he alongwith his father and brother, runs a cloth shop near Bus Stand, Morinda. He has further informed that they have one Duster Car bearing registration no.PB12-X-4838 and they usually park the same backside the bus stand at Bangala Basti. At about 7.40 PM, when he alongwith his brother has started their car from the parking, then one Swift Car suddenly stopped in front of their car. He said car total three persons have been sitting. On the rear seat, accused Gurpreet Singh resident of Gharuan has been sitting. Then, accused Gurpreet Singh has started pelting stones towards their car. One person sitting in the car has been holding a revolver type weapon in his hand. As they got scared and his brother namely Jaspreet Singh, who has been driving the car at that time reversed the car due to which, there car hit against a pole and wall in backside. Gurpreet Singh kept pelting stones on them and combined with his abuses. He has further stated that reason for attack by Gurpreet Singh has been that he has purchased clothes from their shop on credit and they have been demanding pending amount from him. Thereafter, they fled away from the spot. Accordingly, the matter has been reported to the police. The statement of informant has been got signed from complainant and further attested by I.O., who has entered police proceedings in the statement itself. After registration of FIR the investigation has been pressed into rough site plan has been prepared at the instance of complainant. RC of Duster Car has been taken into police possession. Statements of

witnesses has been recorded. On 28.07.2016 accused Gurpreet Singh has been arrested on the production warrants. During interrogation, accused Gurpreet Singh has disclosed the name of Sukhdeep Singh, who has then later arrested on 21.02.2017. The Swift car bearing no. PB12-W-7409 has been taken into possession alongwith its RC. After completion of investigation in all respects challan under section 173 of Code of Criminal Procedure has been presented in the Court.

3. On presentation of challan copies of documents, relied upon by the prosecution, have been supplied to the accused free of cost as required under section 207 of Code of Criminal Procedure.

4. Finding a prima facie case for the offence under section 341, 506 and 427 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, charge has been framed against the accused, to which he has pleaded not guilty and have claimed trial.

PROSECUTION EVIDENCE

5. Charge has been framed on 24.10.2017. To prove its case the prosecution has examined as many as six witnesses. The prosecution has examined complainant Jagpreet Singh as PW1, who has deposed that he is running a cloth shop under the name and style of “New Fashion Shop” with his father Sarabjit Singh and brother Jaspreet Singh. He has deposed that they are having Duster Renault Car bearing registration no. PB-12-X-8438 and they usually park their car on the backside of bus stand in Bangala Basti. He has further deposed that on 19.03.2016, at about 7.40 PM when they have started their car from the said parking,

then one Swift Car overtook them and has been parked in front of their car. He has further deposed that accused Gurpreet Singh and two more persons has been sitting in the car. Then, accused Gurpreet Singh has started pelting stones towards their car which hit the front screen of their car and he was also abused them. He has further deposed that he also saw one another person sitting in the car who has been carrying a revolver type weapon. Being scared and nervous, his brother namely Jaspreet Singh, who has been driving the car, reversed the same, due to which, the car hit against a pole from backside and then they fled from the spot. He has further deposed that thereafter, on the same night he alongwith his brother have went to police station where his statement has been got recorded by the police. He has seen and identified his statement on judicial file, Ex.PW1/A. He has identified his signatures at point 'A' on the same. His brother has also corroborated his statement by putting his signature at point 'B'. He has seen and identified original RC Ex.MO-1 of his Duster Car on the judicial file. He has further deposed that on 28.02.2017, he has produced five photographs before HC Harpal Singh which have been taken into police possession by him vide recovery memo Ex.PW1/B which has been signed by him at point 'A'. He has also seen and identified five photographs on the judicial file which is Ex.MO-1 to Ex.MO-5. He has identified accused Gurpreet Singh present in the court. He has deposed that he has brought the Duster Car bearing no.PB12-X-8438 as Ex.MO-6. He has failed to disclose the registration number of car of the accused, but stated that he can identify

the same, if produced before him.

Further, PW-2 Jaspreet Singh has deposed that he alongwith his brother are running a cloth shop under the name and style of “New Fashion Shop” with his father Sarabjit Singh. He has deposed that they are having Duster Renault Car bearing registration no.PB12-X-8438 and they usually park their car on the backside of bus stand in Bangala Basti. He has further deposed that on 19.03.2016 at about 7.40 PM when they have started their car from the said parking then he has been driving the said car. He has further deposed that one Swift Car came suddenly and parked the same in front of their car. He has further deposed that accused Gurpreet Singh and two more persons have been sitting in the car and accused Gurpreet Singh started pelting stones towards their car which hit on front screen of their car and he also abused them. He has further deposed that then he saw another person sitting in the car who has been holding a revolver like weapon and on seeing the weapon, he and his brother got scared. He has further deposed that in order to retrieve from the spot, he reversed their car which hit against a pole on backside. He has further deposed that thereafter they have fled from the spot. He stated that the reason for the attack has been that Gurpreet Singh has not returned the money for the clothes which he has bought from their shop on credit and their father has been demanding the same from him, but he has been postponing it and for the said reason, he has attacked him and his brother. He has further deposed that after the said incident he and his brother have met the police officials, near

Kianour Chowk, Morinda. He and his brother have got recorded the statement Ex.PW1/A and after recording the statement, police have read over the same to them and his brother has signed at point 'A' and he has signed at point 'B' on said statement. He stated that his statement has also been recorded by the police officials. He has further stated that police has prepared the rough site plan on the instruction of his brother. He has identified the accused present in the court.

Further, PW-3 Retd. ASI Hakam Singh, has deposed that on 19.03.2013, he has been posted as ASI at PS City Morinda. On the above said day, he alongwith police party have been on regular patrolling and present at Kainaur Chowk, Morinda. He has further deposed that complainant in the present case namely Jagpreet Singh, son of Sarabjit Singh, resident of Ward No.3, Morinda has come alongwith his brother Jaspreet Singh and they have got recorded his statement Ex.PW1/A with regard to assault that took place at the backside of bus stand in Bangala Basti. He has deposed that he has recorded the statement of complainant in verbatim and after recording the same, it has been read over to him and thereafter statement has been signed at point 'A' by complainant and by his brother at point 'B'. He has further deposed that he has scribed ruqa Ex.PW3/A and sent the same through Constable Amritpal for lodging formal FIR, on the basis of which, formal FIR Ex.PW3/B was lodged by SI Didar Singh. He identified his signature. He has further deposed that he alongwith complainant went to place of incident and then rough site plan Ex.PW4/C has been prepared by him. He has further

deposed that the vehicle of complainant bearing No.PB12-X-8458 has been taken into police possession vide memo Ex.PW4/D. He has recorded statements of witnesses. Thereafter he has been transferred and further investigation has been conducted by HC Harpal Singh.

PW-4 HC Balbir Singh (wrongly mentioned as PW-5 in the file) has deposed that on 28.07.2016, he has been on duty as Escort Guard. On the said date, accused Gurpreet Singh involved in the present FIR, has been produced before the Hon'ble Court of Ms. Supreet Kaur, the then JMIC, Rupnagar on production warrants and from there has been formally arrested vide memo Ex.PW5/A. Personal search of accused has been conducted vide memo Ex.PW5/B. He deposed that he signed both the exhibits as witness. His statement was recorded by the IO. He identified accused Gurpreet Singh present in the court.

PW-5 HC Harpal Singh (wrongly mentioned as PE-6 in the file) has deposed that he has been handed over the investigation of this case on 10.05.2016 when he has been posted at PP City Morinda. He has deposed that , accused Gurpreet Singh, son of Sukhpreet Singh has been produced on production warrants on 28.07.2016 before the Court of Illaqa Magistrate Ms. Supreet Kaur, Ld. JMIC. He has further deposed that after inquiry, accused Gurpreet Singh has been arrested by him vide arrest memo Ex.PW5/A and has been personally searched vide personal search memo Ex.PW5/B. He has deposed that on both these memos HC Balbir Singh and HC Rajwant Singh have signed as attesting witnesses and he identified the signatures on both the memos. He has further

deposed that during investigation, accused Gurpreet Singh has disclosed about the involvement of Sukhdeep Singh in the present case and also disclosed about car bearing no.PB-12-W-7409. He has further deposed that on 21.02.2017, accused Sukhdeep Singh has been produced by Lambardar Baisakha Singh at PP City Morinda and he arrested Sukhdeep Singh vide arrest memo Ex.PW6/A and has personally searched him vide memo Ex.PW6/B and both HC Manjit Singh and Baisakha Singh have signed on both these memos as attesting witnesses. He has deposed that he has taken the possession of car bearing no.PB-12-W-7409 alongwith RC after the same has been presented to him by Baisakha Singh vide memo Ex.PW6/C and HC Manjit Singh has signed the same as attesting witness. He has further deposed that on 28.02.2017, Jagpreet Singh presented to him photos of car bearing no. PB12-X-8438 mark a Duster alongwith bill regarding damage which he has taken into possession vide memo Ex.PW1/B and HC Manjit Singh has signed the same as attesting witness. The Photographs Ex.MO1 to Ex.MO5. He has deposed that during investigation, he has got proved the RC of vehicles and recorded the statements of witnesses under Section 161 Cr.P.C. He has identified the accused Sukhdeep Singh present in the court.

PW-6 Manpreet Kaur(wrongly mentioned as PW-7 in the file) DEO, Office of RLA Rupnagar, has deposed on the basis of summoned record brought by her i.e. screen report of car bearing registration No.PB-12-X-8438 which has been issued for Duster Renault Car and owned by Jaspreet Singh, son of Sarabjit Singh, resident of

H.No.624, Surjit Nagar, Ward No.1, Morinda, District Rupnagar. He has seen the certified copy of the same in the judicial file and same is Ex.PW7/A. She has identified the signature of Ravi Dutt on the same. She has seen original RC of above vehicle and same is Ex.MO-I. She has also produced the record of vehicle No.PB-12-W-7409 which has been issued for Swift VDI Car is owned by Sukhdeep Singh, son of Nirmal Singh, resident of Village Amrali, Tehsil Chamkaur Sahib, District Rupnagar. She has also seen certified computerized generated copy of screening report of above vehicle and same is Ex.PW7/B. She has identified the signature of Ravi Dutt on the same. She has also seen original RC of above vehicle on judicial file same as Ex. MO-II. She deposed that IO has recorded statement of the then Clerk of RLA Office, Rupnagar.

Thereafter, prosecution has failed to conclude its evidence. Accordingly, prosecution evidence has been closed by order vide order dated 10.05.2019.

6. After completion of prosecution evidence, statement of accused Gurpreet Singh under section 313 Cr.P.C. has been recorded, wherein, every incriminating material, appearing against him in the prosecution evidence, has been put to them, to which he has pleaded innocent and false implication and has stated that he wants to lead evidence in his defence.

No evidence has been led in defence. Thereafter, accused has closed his evidence.

ARGUMENTS

7. It is upon the prosecution to prove the guilt of accused beyond all shadow of reasonable doubt by producing cogent and convincing evidence. Learned APP for the state has argued that PW-1 Jagpreet Singh has specifically stated about the involvement of accused Gurpreet Singh in the occurrence dated 19.03.2016 by stating that it was Gurpreet Singh who has pelted stones towards their car which have hit the front screen of their car bearing no. PB-12-X-4838 and also abused them. He has also deposed that Gurpreet Singh has been standing outside but another person has been sitting in the car and has been handing revolver type weapon and on seeing him they got nervous and reversed their car and hit into their pole. The Ld. APP for the State has argued that statement of PW-1 is supported and corroborated by PW-2 Jaspreet Singh who is none else but brother of PW-1 and has been present along with PW-1 at the time of incident and has duly identified Gurpreet Singh as the person who has attacked and damaged their car bearing no. PB-12-X-8438 on 19.03.2016 by pelting stones on the same. Further argued that the remaining investigation proceedings have been duly proved on record by PW-3 Retd. ASI Hakam Singh, PW-4 HC Balbir Singh and PW-5 HC Harpal Singh. Further argued that motive of previous enmity between the complainant and accused Gurpreet Singh has also been stated by PW-1 and PW-2 who have stated that accused Gurpreet Singh has purchased cloth on credit from there shop but despite their repeated requests, he has failed to return the same due to which he

has attacked and damaged their car. Further argued that accused Gurpreet Singh is well known to the complainant and their family, as such, question of identification of accused does not arise in present case. Lastly prayed that all the prosecution witnesses have duly proved the prosecution story, as such, accused Gurpreet Singh is liable to be convicted.

On the other hand, learned defence counsel Sh. Sahib Singh Khurl, Advocate has vehemently argued that main allegations of prosecution is that on 19.03.2016, the accused has attacked and has damaged the car of complainant by pelting stones on the same but the said car has not been produced in the Court, during the trial and its identification has remained unproved on record. Further argued that the Test Report of said vehicle has also not been produced on record to prove its damage. Further argued that the main allegations of prosecution is that the enmity between complainant and accused Gurpreet Singh has been regarding the pending amount of purchased of clothes but no bills of said sale have been produced on record by the prosecution and therefore, the motive stated by PW-1 and PW-2, has remained unproved on record. Lastly prayed that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and has prayed for acquittal of accused.

POINTS FOR DETERMINATION

8. After hearing learned APP and learned defence counsel and upon perusal of the file following points emerge for determination in the present case:-

A. Whether on 19.03.2016 at about 7:40 PM in the area of Bangala Basti behind bus stand Morinda, District Rupnagar both accused namely Gurpreet Singh and Sukhdeep Singh in furtherance of common intention of both of them, wrongfully restrained complainant Jagpreet Singh and his brother Jaspreet Singh and their car bearing No. PB12-X-4838 make Duster Renault owned by Jaspreet Singh and, thereby, committed an offence punishable under Section 341 read with 34 IPC?

B. Whether on same date, time and place both the accused in furtherance of common intention of both of them wrongfully restrained complainant Jagpreet Singh and his brother Jaspreet Singh in their car bearing No. PB12-X-4838 make Duster Renault owned by Jaspreet Singh and extended threats to kill them and thus criminally intimidated them by putting them at alarm and therefore committed an offence punishable under Section 506 IPC read with 34 IPC?

C. Whether on same date, time and place above named both the above stated accused, in furtherance of common intention of each other, wrongfully restrained complainant Jagpreet Singh and his brother Jaspreet Singh in their car bearing No. PB12-X-4838 make Duster Renault owned by Jaspreet Singh and damaged the same and caused loss amounting to more than Rs.50/- and therefore both the accused committed an offence punishable under Section 427 IPC read with 34 IPC?”

POINTS A to C

9. Having deliberated upon the rival contentions of both the sides and going through the case file properly, it comes out that accused

has been charged with the allegations of wrongful restraint and attack on complainant Jagpreet Singh and his brother namely Jaspreet Singh by accused Gurpreet Singh by stopping their car and attacking them with stones. It is the cardinal principle of criminal jurisprudence that evidence of eye witness or injured is the best evidence to connect accused with occurrence in question. The present case hinges on the testimony of complainant PW-1 Jagpreet Singh and eye witness PW-2 Jaspreet Singh who have specifically stated in the court that on 19.03.2016, it was accused Gurpreet Singh, facing trial who has attacked them and has pelted stones towards their car which have hit the front screen of their car. In present case, complainant Jagpreet Singh, while appearing as PW-1 has categorically stated that on 19.03.2016, when he along with his brother namely Jaspreet Singh left from their shop in their car bearing no. PB-12X-8438 then they have been stopped on their way by accused Gurpreet Singh by parking one swift car in front of their vehicle. Gurpreet Singh has been accompanied by two more persons who have been sitting in the car. Thereafter, Gurpreet Singh has started pelting stones at their car which have hit on the front screen of their car and also abused them. Another person, sitting in the car, has been holding a revolver type weapon and on seeing him, the brother of complainant namely Jaspreet Singh became scared and nervous and when they have tried to rush from the spot and put reverse gear then their car has hit into a pole on the backside of their car and thereafter they have fled from the spot. Same night they have approached the police and his statement Ex.

PW-1/A has been recorded and same has been countersigned by his brother at point 'B'. The statement of PW-1 Jagpreet Singh has been duly supported and corroborated by PW-2 Jaspreet Singh who has stated that on 19.03.2016 at about 7:40PM he along with his brother Jagpreet Singh have left from their shop namely "New Fashion Shop" in their Duster Renault Car bearing registration no. PB-12X-8438. While they have been on their way then they have been stopped by one swift car which has overtaken them and has been parked in front of their car. Gurpreet Singh has come out of that car and has started pelting stones at them which have hit on the front screen of their car and same has been broken. Gurpreet Singh has also used abusive language. Meanwhile they have noticed the presence of another person in the swift car who has been holding a revolver type weapon. On seeing the weapon he and his brother became scared and when he tried to reverse the car then same hit into the pole on the backside of their car. They fled from the spot being nervous and scared. After reaching home he and his brother have decided to approach the police. Then they met police officials near Kainaur Chowk, Morinda and police officials have recorded the statement of his brother which has been signed by him and his brother. He has also deposed that motive and reason for attacking them, by accused Gurpreet Singh, is that said Gurpreet Singh has purchased clothes from there shop on credit but despite repeated demands by their father he has not been able to return the pending amount. From the testimony of PW-1 and PW-2, the identity of accused Gurpreet Singh has been duly proved on record

as both PW-1 and PW-2 have identified him. Further during their cross examination, nothing has emerged on record to doubt their statements regarding the identification of accused Gurpreet Singh. As PW-1 and PW-2 have categorically stated that it is Gurpreet Singh who has purchased clothes from there shop for the wedding of his sister. PW-1 has also stated that he know Gurpreet Singh from last 4-5 years due to business relations. Later he has also stated that there relations got spoiled due to non-payment of money by Gurpreet Singh. From this statement, it is clear that there is no dispute regarding the identity of Gurpreet Singh as he is already known to complainant I.e. PW-1 and his brother PW-2. Further PW-1 has stated that at the time of occurrence, the offending car has been parked near to their car. PW-2 Jaspreet Singh has stated that distance between two cars have been 20-25 meters which means that they have clearly seen the person who has attacked them and their car. PW-1 and PW-2 have stated that it is Gurpreet Singh who has hurled abuses to them and pelted stones at their car. It is relevant to mention that during the lengthy cross-examination of PW-1 and PW-2, not been single suggestion has been put to them regarding false implication of Gurpreet Singh or his absence at the alleged time and place of occurrence.

Further the photographs Ex. MO1 to Ex. MO5, showing the damage caused to car bearing No. PB-12X-8438, have been duly proved on record by PW-1, PW-2 and PW-5 HC Harpal Singh, which duly supports the version of PW-1 and PW-2. Though PW-1 Jagpreet Singh

has admitted that photographs Ex. D-1 to Ex. D-3 does bear the number plate of the car, as such, they cannot be relied to be related to the car of complainant. Regarding the said argument of the defence counsel, I am of the considered opinion that total five photographs of the damaged car have been placed on the file by the prosecution and same are Ex. MO-1 to Ex. MO-5 and it is the settled principle of criminal jurisprudence that the evidence has to be appreciated in its entirety and not in bits and pieces. Therefore, merely because three photographs does not reflect the plate number of the car does not render them inadmissible as they are the closeup shots of the damaged portion of the car and hence relevant and admissible. Further, it is also not the plea of the accused that these photographs are not of car bearing number PB-12-X-8438. Further during the cross-examination of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-5 not even single suggestion of photographs being fake or edited or photoshopped or of another car has been put to PW-1 and PW-2.

Further the defence counsel has argued that the broken damaged pieces of the window pane and stones have not been taken into possession by police officials or that the bills of repair have not been placed on file by prosecution which creates lacuna in the evidence and renders the version of PW-1 and PW-2 unreliable. Regarding said argument, I am of the considered opinion that this argument of defence counsel does not hold much weightage especially in the light of the fact that PW-1 has stated in his cross-examination that he has kept all the bills of repair of their car. At said point of time, the defence counsel had

every opportunity to seek direction to the witness for producing the said bills if he wanted to create dent in the testimony of PW-1 but he failed to do so and said point cannot be agitated at this stage when the other relevant evidence is already on the file duly establishing the identity of accused Gurpreet Singh.

Further, it is relevant to mention that during the recording of statement under Section 313 CrPC, the accused has simply taken the plea that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case but nowhere he has felt the necessity of justifying as to why he has been falsely implicated by the complainant or why in the entire world, the complainant has chosen only him for raising allegations especially when they share good relations with each other. Further when accused has come to know about the present FIR then he has not filed any counter complaint against the complainant and has remained silent till date. There is nothing proved on record by the accused that any of the prosecution witnesses had any previous enmity or ulterior motive to falsely implicate him.

CONCLUSION

10. The analytic appraisal of the entire material and evidence on record makes it abundantly clear that all the prosecution witnesses have fully established the guilt of accused Gurpreet Singh beyond shadow of reasonable doubt to the extent that accused has not only wrongfully restrained the complainant and his brother Jaspreet Singh in their car bearing No.PB-12X-8438 on 19.03.2016 and pelted stones at their car

and damaged the same and also threatened them with dire consequences. The entire evidence on record warrants and require conviction of the accused Gurpreet Singh s/o Sukhpreet Singh and he is convicted for charges under Section 341, 427 and 506 IPC framed against him. As far as offence under Section 34 of IPC is concerned the co-accused Sukhdeep Singh has already been acquitted vide order dated 08.11.2019 and there is nothing on record to prove that accused Gurpreet Singh acted in furtherance of common intention. Let, convict be taken into custody and be heard on the quantum of sentence.

Pronounced in open Court:
Dated: 20.04.2022
Umesh Kumar, STG III

Manpreet Kaur, PCS
Judicial Magistrate 1st class,
Rupnagar/UID No.PB-0403.

QUANTUM OF SENTENCE

Present: Sh. Raman Gill, Assistant Public Prosecutor for the State.
Convict Gurpreet Singh in custody.

11. Ld. APP for the State has argued that deterrent punishment shall be awarded to the convict. On the other hand, defence counsel has requested for lenient view as convict Gurpreet Singh is young and his conviction may bring unwarranted consequences to his future and reputation of family. After hearing the Ld. APP for the State and the defence counsel on the quantum of sentence, I am the considered opinion that offence committed by Gurpreet Singh is such that it shakes the very peace and tranquility prevailing in the society. Such offence does not deserve lenient view. Accordingly, instead of releasing convict Gurpreet Singh on probation, I deem it fit and necessary to award the following sentence:-

<u>Name of accused</u> Gurpreet Singh	<u>Sentence Under Section 341 IPC</u> Fine ₹ 500/- and in default of payment of fine to further undergo simple imprisonment for 10 days. <u>Sentence Under Section 427 IPC</u> Simple imprisonment for six months and fine ₹ 4,000/- and in default of payment of fine to further undergo simple imprisonment for three months. <u>Sentence Under Section 506 IPC</u> Simple imprisonment for six months and fine ₹ 4,000/- and in default of payment of fine to further undergo simple imprisonment for three months.
--	---

12. However, it is made clear that any period spent by the convict in the jail in this case, shall be set off against his respective substantive sentence awarded to him. Fine paid. Receipt issued. Case property, if any, be disposed of in accordance with rules after expiry of period of appeal or revision, if none is filed and subject to the decision of appeal or revision, if one is filed. File be consigned to the Judicial Record Room, Rupnagar after due compliance.

Pronounced in open Court
Dated: 20.04.2022
Umesh Kumar, STG III

Manpreet Kaur,
Judicial Magistrate 1st class,
Rupnagar/UID No.PB-0403.