

State of Punjab Vs Satpal and others

Court: High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Date of Decision: April 26, 2006

Acts Referred: Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) " Section 304

Citation: (2006) 3 RCR(Criminal) 213

Hon'ble Judges: R.S. Madan, J; K.S. Garewal, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: A.S. Virk,A.A.G, for the Appellant; T.S. Sangha, Advocate For the Revision-Petitioner Shri A.S. Jattana, for the Appearing Parties

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

K.S. Garewal, J.

State of Punjab has filed Criminal Appeal No. 586-DBA of 2003 to challenge the judgment of the learned Additional

Sessions Judge (Ad hoc) Patiala dated October 18, 2002 whereby Sat Pal and five others were acquitted of the murder of Thakur Dass Batra.

Ashwani Kumar and Manohar Lal were acquitted outright but Sat Pal, Chaman Lal alias Surinder Kumar, Bhim Sain and Darshan Kumar were

convicted under Sections 304 Part II IPC. Sat Pal and Bhim Sain were sentenced to the period already undergone by them. Darshan Kumar and

Chaman Lal alias Surinder Kumar were sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of four years u/s 304 Part II read with Section

34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Chaman Lal alias Surinder Kumar and Darshan Kumar have filed Criminal appeal No. 1778-SB of 2002 against their conviction and sentence.

Kulbhushan Kumar son of Thakur Dass Batra deceased, has filed Criminal Revision No. 467 of 2003 to challenge the acquittal of the six accused.

3. All the three above mentioned cases have been heard and are being disposed of by this common judgment.

4. On August 4, 2000 at 10.00 p.m. there occurred a quarrel between two neighbouring shopkeepers at Patran, District Patiala. This led to

exchange of abuses and hot words. When Kulbhushan, son of Thakur Dass Batra deceased, along with his brother Subhash Chand and his

deceased father were going to close their shop as usual, the owner of the adjoining shop ""Goel Sweets"" Chaman Lal alias Surinder Kumar

remarked that Kulbhushan had abused them. In the meantime Chaman Lal's brother Darshan Kumar punched Kulbhushan on the face. Chaman

Lal's other brothers Bhim Sain alias Bhola, Sat Pal and nephews Ashwani and Manohar Lal were also present there. When Thakur Dass Batra

and Subash Chand stepped forward to save Kulbhushan the above mentioned persons attacked them. Sat Pal gave a dang blow on Thakur Dass

Batra's forehead. Darshan Kumar picked up a khurchana (scraper) from his shop and with it hit Thakur Dass Batra on the left leg. Bhim Sain and

Manohar Lal kept punching Subhash Chand. Sat Pal and Manohar Lal caught hold Thakur Dass Batra from his arms and felled him down.

Thereafter Chaman Lal alias Surinder Kumar and Darshan Kumar punched and kicked Thakur Dass Batra on his testicles and in the abdomen.

Alarm was raised which attracted Om Parkash, Lekh Raj and Shammi Kumar to the spot. Thakur Dass Batra was released from the clutches of

the attackers who managed to escape from the spot with their respective weapons. Thakur Dass was taken to Durga Das Hospital for treatment

where he was declared dead.

5. Kulbhushan Kumar's statement was recorded on August 5, 2000 at 2.30 a.m. and on its basis the case was registered at 3.30 a.m. at Police

Station, Patran. Special report was received by Judicial Magistrate Samana at 10.30 a.m. on August 5, 2000.

6. Investigation was commenced by carrying out the inquest proceedings on the dead body of Thakur Dass Batra whereafter the dead body was

sent for post- mortem examination which was conducted by Dr. Satish Arora, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Samana. The Medical Officer found

the following injuries :-

1. Swelling 17 cm. x 10 cm. on the right inguno-scrotal region.
2. Abrasion 1 cm x 1 cm on the left side of forehead.
3. Reddish contusion 10 cm x 3 cm on the front of right shoulder region.
4. Abrasion 15 cm x 2 cm on the lateral side of left upper limb.
5. Abrasion on front of left knee 1 cm x 1 cm.

On dissection the Medical Officer found extravascation of blood in the underlying tissues of scrotum and inguinal region on the right side.

Haematoma was present in the right scrotal region. Right testicle was ecchymosed. Left scrotal region was healthy. In the opinion of the Medical

Officer death was due to right testicular injury resulting in shock which was sufficient to cause death in the ordinary course of nature.

7. Kulbhushan was medico-legally examined at 2.00 p.m. on August 5 and found to have the following injuries on his person :-

1. Reddish contusion 3 cm x 3 cm on the lateral side of right iliac region.

2. Reddish contusion 3.5 cm x 2.5 cm on the right xyomatic region of face.
3. Abrasion 2 cm x .3 cm on the left lower lip.
4. Abrasion 3 cm x .05 cm on the front of left leg in the middle.
5. Tender swelling left middle finger. Advised X-ray.
6. Complained of pain on the right thigh.

On Parkash was medico-legally examined at 2.30 p.m. on August 5 and he had the following injury :-

Reddish contusion 8 cm x 3 cm on the right gluteal region.

8. In the first instance only four accused/respondents, Sat Pal, Chaman Lal alias Surinder Kumar, Bhim Sain alias Bhola and Darshan Kumar were

sent up for trial. Charge was framed against them under Sections 302/323/34 IPC on January 18, 2001 an application was moved u/s 319

Cr.P.C. which was accepted and Ashwani Kumar and Manohar Lal were summoned to face trial. Charge was again framed on March 22, 2002

under Sections 302/148/149/323/34 IPC against all six accused/respondents to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

9. The fact that the accused had pleaded not guilty and claimed trial is probably the key to the decision of these cases. The plea of the accused

was recorded by the learned Additional Sessions Judge on March 22, 2002, the case was adjourned to May 23, 2002, for prosecution evidence.

It was again adjourned to August 26, 2002 but in the meanwhile the trial was transferred from the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala to

the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge (Ad hoc) Fast Track Court, Patiala and the accused appeared before the transferee Court on

August 26, 2002. On this day statements of Dr. Mamta Sharma (PW-1) and Dr. Satish Arora (PW-2) were recorded.

10. The learned trial Judge did not record any further evidence but decided the case on the basis of ""confessions"" made by Sat Pal, Chaman Lal

alias Surinder Kumar, Bhim Sain and Darshan Kumar on October 18, 2002. These statements of the accused were accepted and led to the

conviction of four of them u/s 304 Part II IPC. Ashwani Kumar and Manohar Lal were acquitted. Out of the four convicted accused Chaman Lal

alias Surinder Kumar and Darshan Kumar were sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for 4 years and other two Sat Pal and Bhim Sain alias Bhola

were sentenced to the period already undergone. It may be appropriate to reproduce here the statement of Chaman Lal alias Surinder Kumar

accused recorded without oath on August 18, 2002. The other accused also made similar statements. Statement made by Chaman Lal alias

Surinder Kumar was as follows :-

On 4.8.2000 at about 10.00 p.m. I Surinder Kumar alias Chaman Lal along with Darshan Kumar, Sat Pal and Bhim Sain alias Bhola were present

at my shop. The incident started from abuses and it developed into altercation at the spur of the moment. However, injuries were received by

Thakur Dass, Kulbhushan and Om Parkash at our hands. The occurrence was at the spur of the moment. Manohar Lal and Ashwani Kumar did

not cause any injury. I confess my guilt with a prayer that leniency be shown at the point of sentence.

11. A trial before the Court of Sessions is conducted under the provisions of Chapter XVIII (Sections 225 to 237) of the Code of Criminal

Procedure. Every trial before the Court of Sessions commences with the Public Prosecutor opening the case by describing the charge brought

against the accused and the evidence with which he proposes to prove the guilt of the accused. After consideration of the record of the case, the

documents submitted therewith and after hearing the submissions of the accused and the prosecution in this behalf, if the Judge considers that there

are no sufficient grounds for proceeding against the accused, the accused is discharged and reasons are recorded. If the Judge is of the opinion that

there is ground for presuming that the accused has committed an offence and, the offence is exclusively triable by him, he frames in writing a

charge-sheet against the accused and the accused is asked whether he pleads guilty to the charge framed or claims to be tried.

12. Therefore, if the accused does not plead guilty to the charge and claims to be tried, the Judge fixes a date for the examination of the witnesses,

but if the accused pleads guilty the Judge records the plea and may convict him thereon.

13. In the present case the accused had not pleaded guilty to the charge and had as a matter of fact claimed to be tried. The trial had been listed

for recording prosecution evidence. Therefore, it is obvious that after the charge was framed plea of not guilty had been recorded. Thereafter, it is

obvious that after the charge was framed plea of not guilty had been recorded. Thereafter the stage for recording the statements of the accused or

their fresh plea had passed. The case was scheduled for recording prosecution evidence.

14. Whatever may be the reason for which the learned trial Judge re-recorded the plea of the four of the accused, it cannot be overlooked that the

stage for recording the pleas had actually been crossed. The Court was now required to record the evidence produced by the prosecution. There

was no choice with the Court, except to conclude the recording of the prosecution evidence and then proceed to examining the accused. After

hearing the accused he could record an order of acquittal if he considered that there was no evidence that the accused had committed an offence.

We do not think that the statements of the accused recorded on October 18, 2002 were covered by the provisions of Section 313(1)(a) of the

Code of Criminal Procedure which entitled the Court to put such questions to the accused as considered necessary, at any stage and without

previously warning accused.

15. The learned Judge neither concluded the recorded of the statement of the prosecution nor did he record an order of acquittal. The learned

Judge did not even record the statements of the accused u/s 313 Cr.P.C. because he thought it to be a case in which recording of the statements

ought to be dispensed with. In a surprising turnaround of events the learned Judge cut short the trial by recording the statements of four of the

accused admitting their guilt and proceeded to convict them u/s 304 Part II IPC. The two remaining accused were acquitted.

16. It is extremely doubtful if the course adopted by the learned trial Judge was legal because the trial before the Court of Sessions proceeds step

by step and once a particular step has been taken or a particular stage has been crossed, the steps taken cannot be retraced. This means that once

the stage for recording prosecution evidence had been reached the evidence of the prosecution shall have to be recorded until it is concluded. This

was not the stage to go back to the stage of charge and record pleas of some of the accused as the learned trial Judge has done.

17. Resultantly, Criminal Appeal No. 586-DBA of 2002 entitled State of Punjab v. Sat Pal and others is allowed. The judgment of the learned

Additional Sessions Judge (Ad hoc) Patiala dated October 18, 2002 is hereby set aside and accused are directed to be retried as provided by

Section 386(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure on the basis of the charge framed against them on March 22, 2002 and the pleas recorded by

them on March 22, 2002.

18. The accused/respondents shall surrender before the learned Sessions Judge, Patiala on or before May 15, 2006 and shall be admitted to bail

by the learned Sessions Judge after they furnish adequate surety to his satisfaction. The trial against the accused/respondents shall continue from the

stage the case had reached on October 18, 2002. The learned Sessions Judge shall try the case himself and conclude the trial as expeditiously as

possible, preferably by August 31, 2006. Records of the trial Court be sent back immediately.

Criminal Appeal No. 1778-SB of 2002 entitled Chaman Lal and another v. State of Punjab and Criminal Revision No. 467 of 2003 entitled

Kumbhushan Kumar v. Sat Pal and others are dismissed.