

who does that act must not be held guilty of an offence merely because subsequently a law is made making such act an offence. When the petitioner is alleged to have committed the offences under various sections of the Domestic Violence Act, which is not in force on the date of such acts, then the charge framed under the said sections would not be maintainable in view of Art. 20(1) of the Constitution as the said penal provisions were not in existence when the alleged offences were committed. In fact, there was no law in force at the time when the petitioner allegedly committed these acts and, therefore, would be entitled to the Protection of Art. 20(1) of the Constitution. Once the Act came into operation on 26th October, 2006, the various provisions of the Act creating offences would not be an offences for which the petitioner can be put to trial. The action of the court in taking cognizance on the basis of this complaint on 19th July, 2006, as such, cannot be sustained. The summoning order, thus, cannot be sustained and the same is set-aside.

(4) The petition is allowed.

---

**R.N.R.**

*Before Kanwaljit Singh Ahluwalia, J.*

**MALKIAT SINGH DHALIWAL, —Petitioner**

*versus*

**MANPREET KAUR DHALIWAL AND ANOTHER, —Respondents**

Criminal Misc. No. 4542-M of 2008

6th January, 2009

*Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973—S. 482—Prevention of Atrocities of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act, 1999—S. 3(1)x—Prosecution filing cancellation report in case u/s 3(1)(x) of 1999 Act—Trial Court failing to record reasons in not accepting cancellation report—In case of rejection of cancellation report SDJM had to straightway take the cognizance u/s 190(1)(b) and issue process straightway or he could have ordered further investigation—Summoning order nowhere reveals as to in which*

***fashion SDJM intended to proceed—In no way SDJM could consolidate cancellation report with the protest petition—Petition allowed, summoning order set aside.***

*Held*, that not only summoning order dated 1st May, 2004 is a cryptic order but it also reflects no application of mind as to for what reasons the Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate had not agreed with the cancellation report. The learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate could either accept the cancellation report and in case the cancellation report was to be rejected, he had to straightway take the cognizance under Section 190(1)(b) and had to issue the process straightway or he could have ordered further investigation. In case he had to rely upon the protest petition, then he had to take cognizance under Section 190(1) upon the original complaint dated 25th March, 2004 or on the protest petition treating the same to be a complaint and to proceed under Section 200 and 202 Cr.P.C. and had to record the preliminary evidence. The summoning order nowhere reveals as to in which fashion the Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate intended to proceed. In no way he could consolidate the cancellation report with the protest petition.

(Para 9)

J.S. Brar, Advocate, *for the petitioner.*

C.L. Verma, Advocate *for respondent No. 1.*

Mehardeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General Punjab *for the State.*

***KANWALJIT SINGH AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)***

(1) Present petition has been filed by Malkiat Singh Dhaliwal, Divisional Engineer Telephones, Jagraon, seeking quashing of complaint/protest petition dated 25th March, 2004 (Annexure P-4) and summoning order dated 1st May, 2004 (Annexure P-5).

(2) Case of the petitioner is that he was working as a Senior Divisional Engineer Telephones and had rendered service of more than 32 years. It has been further averred that husband of the complainant, Darshan Singh was working as Sub-Divisional Officer. On 10th October,

MALKIAT SINGH DHALIWAL v. MANPREET KAUR DHALIWAL 905  
AND ANOTHER (*Kanwaljit Singh Ahluwalia, J.*)

2001, he absented from duty and he was issued a show cause notice for violation of departmental rules (Annexure P-1), due to which wife of Darshan Singh had lodged an FIR bearing No. 217 dated 22nd October, 2001 under Section 3(1)x of Prevention of Atrocities of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act, 1999 at Police Station Jagraon. Counsel has further submitted that departmental inquiry was conducted by three senior level officers, who—*vide* Annexure P-9 found the allegations to be false and it was further held therein that complainant and her husband are habitual of making such complaints. It has been further averred that the FIR was investigated and enquired into by the DSP Jagraon, who relied upon the testimony of various witnesses and came to the conclusion that no offence has been committed and that the version of complaint was false, and a cancellation report was submitted. Counsel has further submitted that complainant filed a complaint (Annexure P-4) and also submitted a protest petition in the Court of Illaqua Magistrate, where cancellation report was submitted. Counsel has stated that for the averments made in the petition, the order (Annexure P-5) whereby cognizance has been taken by the Magistrate, is liable to be quashed. Counsel has relied upon order dated 22nd February, 2008 passed by a Coordinate Bench, whereby notice of motion was issued and further proceedings were stayed. Order dated 22nd February, 2008, counsel states, contains all his contentions. Therefore, it will be apposite here to reproduce order dated 22nd February, 2008, which reads as under :

“Present : Mr. J.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

*By filing this petition under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, quashing of complaint titled “Manpreet Kaur Dhaliwal versus Malkiat Singh Dhaliwal” pending in the Court of Judicial Magistrate 1st Class (for short “JMJC”), Jagraon (Annexure P4) and summoning order dated May 1, 2004 (Annexure P5) is sought on the grounds : (i) that petitioner was Senior Divisional Engineer Telegraph (for short “DET”), Jagraon in the year 2001; (ii) that Manpreet Kaur Dhaliwal-complainant is wife of Darshan Singh, Sub-Divisional Officer in the department of Telegraph; (iii) that on the*

*statement of complainant, FIR No. 217 October 22, 2001 under section 3 (i) (x) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short "SC & ST Act") was registered against the petitioner; (iv) that matter was investigated by Deputy Superintendent of Police, Jagraon and it was found that allegations levelled were baseless; (v) that prosecution filed cancellation report in the court of Area Magistrate, Jagraon; (vi) that departmental inquiry was also got conducted by a Board of Senior Officers and it was found that complaint filed by the complainant was false. In the inquiry report, it was also observed that earlier Darshan Singh also filed similar complaint in the year 1997 against his seniors levelling allegations under SC and ST Act; (vii) that the allegations levelled by the petitioner, in brevity, are that on October 11, 2001, petitioner called her husband in the office and used words "Chuhra Chapra" and on account of that, her husband became unconscious. He was admitted in Emergency in Civil Hospital, Jagraon and regained consciousness after 40 hours when he narrated the said incident to her and (viii) that in fact Darshan Singh, SDE was absent on October 10, 2001 and petitioner issued him a notice (Annexure P-1) and on that account, the present complaint was filed against the petitioner.*

*Notice of motion for 12th March, 2008*

*Meanwhile, further proceedings in the complaint titled Manpreet Kaur Dhaliwal versus Malkiat Singh Dhaliwal pending in the Court of JMIC Jagraon shall remain stayed.*

(Sd.) . . . ,  
(Nawab Singh)  
Judge".

22nd February, 2008

(3) Mr. J.S. Brar appearing for the petitioner states that his contentions recorded in the order of notice of motion may be taken as his submissions for consideration by this Court.

MALKIAT SINGH DHALIWAL v. MANPREET KAUR DHALIWAL 907  
AND ANOTHER (*Kanwaljit Singh Ahluwalia, J.*)

(4) Mr. C.L. Verma appearing for the complainant states that departmental inquiry report is not *per-se* admissible. Petitioner is an influential high official and therefore, his grouse is, a false cancellation report has been submitted. He has further stated that show cause notice (Annexure P-1) has been issued later. Leave was duly sanctioned to him on 10th October, 2001.

(5) Before the rival submissions made by the counsel for the parties could be examined, it will be necessary to reproduce the impugned order, which reads as under :

*“Manpreet Kaur versus Malkit Singh*

*Pr : APP/Complainant with R.K. Beri, Advocate*

*Received by transfer; be regd. Complainant has suffered her statement that in her protest petition, she rely upon the inquiry report No. 618, submitted by SP (Headquarter) and she does not want to lead any preliminary evidence. I have heard the learned counsel for the complainant and APP and have also gone through the file in question very carefully. Perusal of the file shows that cancellation report were sent by the police in spite of the inquiry report No. 618 which has already been placed on file in which the inquiry officer had reached at the conclusion that the allegations levelled by the complainant are true as against the accused. In view of the inquiry report No. 618, I do not agree with the cancellation report submitted by the prosecution. Since the inquiry report No. 618 is complete in itself, as such, notice be issued to accused to appear on 3rd July, 2004. Cancellation report and protest petition are ordered to be consolidated.*

(Sd.) . . . ,  
SDJM : 1-5-2004”

(6) A perusal of the above said order will show that the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate has stated that in view of the subsequent inquiry report No. 618, he does not agree with the cancellation report and further ordered that cancellation report and protest petition he consolidated.

(7) I am of the view that such a course is not open to the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate. Reliance can be placed upon '**Pakhandu and others versus State of U.P. and another (1)**', where a similar controversy arose and a reference was made to a Division Bench. The Division Bench, after considering the entire conspectus of case law, held as under :

**“15.** *From the aforesaid decisions, it is thus clear that where the Magistrate receives final report the following four courses are open to him and he may adopt any one of them as the facts and circumstances of the case may require :—*

- (i) He may agreeing with the conclusions arrived at by the police, accept the report and drop the proceedings. But before so doing, he shall given an opportunity of hearing to the complainant ; or*
- (ii) He may take cognizance under Section 190(1) (b) and issue process straightway to the accused without being bound by the conclusions of the investigating agency, where he is satisfied that upon the facts discovered or unearthed by the police, there is sufficient ground to proceed ; or*
- (iii) he may order further investigation, if he is satisfied that the investigation was made in a perfunctory manner, or*
- (iv) he may, without issuing process or dropping the proceedings decide to take cognizance under Section 190 (1)(a) upon the original complaint or protest petition treating the same as complaint and proceed to act under Sections 200 and 202, Cr.P.C. and thereafter decide whether complaint should be dismissed or process should be issued.*

**16.** *Where the Magistrate decides to take cognizance of the case under Section 190(1)(b) of the Code ignoring the*

---

(1) 2002 CrI. L.J. 1210

*conclusions arrived at by the investigating agency and applying his mind independently to the facts emerging from the investigation records, in such a situation the Magistrate is not bound to follow the procedure laid down in Sections 200 and 202 of the Code, and consequently the proviso to Section 202(2), Cr.P.C. will have no application. It would however be relevant to mention that for forming such an independent opinion the Magistrate can act only upon the statements of witnesses recorded by the police in the case diary and other material collected during investigation. It is not permissible for him at that stage to make use of any material other than investigation records, unless he decides to take cognizance under Section 190(1)(a) of the Code and calls upon the complainant to examine himself and the witnesses present if any under Section 200.*

17. *A plain reading of sub-section (2) of Section 202 with the proviso attached thereto makes it clear that question of applying the proviso will arise only in cases where the Magistrate before taking cognizance of the case opts to hold the inquiry. This matter was thoroughly examined by the Apex Court in the latest decision in Rosy versus State of Kerala, (2000)1 JT (SC) 84 : (AIR 2000 SC 637)."*

(8) This view has been further reiterated by Allahabad High Court in '**Surya Bhan versus State of U.P. and another**' (2).

(9) In the present case, not only Annexure P-5 is a cryptic order, but it also reflects no application of mind as to for what reasons the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate had not agreed with the cancellation report. As held in Pakhandu's case (*supra*), the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate could either accept the cancellation report and in case the cancellation report was to be rejected, he had to straightaway take the cognizance under Section 190(1)(b) and had to issue the process straightaway or he could have ordered further investigation. In case he had to rely upon the protest petition, then he had to take

cognizance under Section 190(1)(a) upon the original complaint (Annexure P-4) or on the protest petition treating the same to be a complaint and to proceed under Section 200 and 202 Cr. P.C. and had to record the preliminary evidence. The order (Annexure P-5) nowhere reveals as to in which fashion the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate intended to proceed. In no way he could consolidate the cancellation report with the protest petition.

(10) Therefore, the order (Annexure P-5) cannot be sustained and the same is set aside. The matter is remanded back to the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate to examine the legal proposition enumerated in Pakhandu's and Surya Bhan's case (*supra*) and pass a fresh order after hearing the parties.

(11) With these observations, present petition is disposed off.

---

**R.N.R.**

*Before K.C. Puri, J.*

**RAJUPDESH KAUR AND ANOTHER,—Appellants**

*versus*

**STATE OF PUNJAB,—Respondents**

Criminal Appeal No. 1152-SB of 2008

22nd January, 2008

*Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973—Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988—Ss. 7 & 13(2)—Vigilance Bureau apprehending accused while accepting illegal gratification—Testimony of complainant, shadow witness and Investigating Officer fully proving factum of demand, acceptance and recovery of illegal gratification from accused—Accused failing to prove strong motive for their falsely implication—No case for interference—Appeal dismissed.*

*Held*, that mere fact that the complainant and shadow witness have stated that a lady Constable and other Constables have held Rajupdes Kaur and Rattan Lal accused from the arms does not create any doubt in the prosecution story. No cross-examination was directed