

Karam Chand Vs. State of H.P. & Ors.

CWPIL No. 85/2022

16.10.2024 Present: Mr. K.B. Khajuria, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Navlesh Verma and Ms. Sharmila Patial, Additional Advocates General with Mr. Raj Negi, Deputy Advocate General, for the respondents-State.

Mr. Sat Prakash, Advocate, for respondent No. 4.

Mr. Vijay K. Arora, Advocate, for respondent No. 5.

Mr. Sanjeev Bhushan, Senior Advocate with Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate, for Om Prakash, Deputy Ranger.

Heard. The deponent of the affidavit Om Prakash would have the Court believe that there is a reference of eleven number of trees in Annexure P-2 and the same were however not found on the spot and it is only on this pretext that affidavits after affidavits are being filed by the deponent.

We fail to understand that in case there were no trees, much less eleven trees on the spot, then how the volume thereof has been calculated and specified in the letter addressed by the deponent to the incharge, Police Station Tissa, vide Annexure P-2, dated 21.11.2022 and further how the volume otherwise has been worked out by the team that visited the spot, as is evident from Annexure R-2.

...2...

Confronted with this, learned counsel for the deponent Om Prakash prays for and is granted three weeks' time to file supplementary affidavit.

List on **06.11.2024**, when Investigating Officer alongwith the entire team, which has prepared the documents (Annexure R-2), shall personally appear before this Court and explain their respective stand.

(Tarlok Singh Chauhan)
Judge

(Sushil Kukreja)
Judge

16th October, 2024
(raman)

VIRENDER
BAHADUR

Digitally signed by VIRENDER BAHADUR
DN: cn=VIRENDER BAHADUR, o=VIRENDER BAHADUR,
c=IN, email=virender.bahadur@virenderbahadur.in,
serial=1, version=3
Reason: I am approving this document
Date: 2024.10.17 14:28:56+05:30
PDF-Signer Version: 2023.0.0