



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

**Criminal Revision No. 1921 of 2008 (O&M)  
Reserved on:- 26.09.2025  
Date of Decision: 13.10.2025**

Parveen Walia

.....Petitioner

Versus

Parkash Kaur alias Parkash Rani and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH**

**Argued by:** Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Advocate for  
Mr. G.S.Kaura, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate,  
Ms. Komal Parveen Singh, Advocate and  
Mr. Nipun Gupta, Advocate  
for the respondents.

\*\*\*\*

**KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

1. The instant petition has been preferred against the judgment dated 10.06.2006 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge (Adhoc) cum P.O. Fast Track Court, Ropar, in case FIR No. 102 dated 13.4.2004, under Section 306/34 IPC, registered at Police Station Mohali, whereby respondents No. 2 and 3 were ordered to be acquitted of the charges framed against them. However, respondent No. 1 Parkash Kaur has been convicted under Section 306 IPC and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for a period of two years and to pay a fine of Rs. 2000/-. In default of payment of fine, she was further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months. The complainant has also sought enhancement of the above sentence imposed upon respondent No. 1.



2. Along with the present revision petition, an application bearing **CRM No. 43132 of 2008** under Section 5 of the Limitation Act seeking condonation of delay of 723 days in filing the present revision petition, has been filed.

3. The grounds taken by the learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner to explain the delay in filing the present revision petition is that initially the present revision petition was filed on 3.8.2006. However, the Registry returned the same on 4.8.2006 with some objections. Thereafter, the Clerk working in the office of the counsel for the petitioner left the office on 20.9.2006 and a new Clerk joined the office, who was not aware about the case status and kept the brief of the case with the briefs of disposed of cases. It was only on 1.4.2008, that the brief could be located and the status of the case was checked. Thereafter, the revision petition was filed on 2.4.2008. However, the petition was returned by the Registry with some objections on 23.5.2008. It is further submitted that the learned counsel for the petitioner was busy in shifting of his office on 24.5.2008, due to which the files were mixed up. It was only when on 31.8.2008, the file was located, the present revision petition was filed. It was therefore, the delay of 723 days occurred which is neither intentional nor deliberate.

4. *Per contra*, the learned counsel for the respondents opposes the present application.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for both the parties.

6. Pertinently, the petition was first filed in the year 2006. It is apparent that the litigation was not actively pursued in the present case, leading to an inordinate delay of over two years. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also not been able to even *prima facie* establish a case in his



favour so as to justify the condonation of such an inordinate delay. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that respondent No. 2-Santosh Kumari, who is the sister of respondent No. 1-Parkash Kaur alias Parkash Rani, has been residing separately at Jalandhar. Similarly, respondent No. 3-Renu alias Bobby Chopra, who is the daughter of respondent No.1-Parkash Kaur alias Parkash Rani, was married in the year 2002, and has also been residing in her in-laws house since then. Therefore, the involvement of respondents No. 2 and 3 have not been established beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt.

7. Moreover, insofar as accused/respondent No. 1-Parkash Kaur alias Parkash Rani, is concerned, vide order of even date passed by this Court in a connected case i.e. *CRA-S-1168-SB-2006*, she has been acquitted of the charges framed against her.

8. Consequently, in view of the afore discussion, and in the absence of any plausible or reasonable explanation advanced as 'sufficient cause', the present application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condonation of delay in filing the present revision petition is hereby dismissed.

9. Since the application for condonation of delay is dismissed, the present revision petition also stands dismissed.

10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)  
JUDGE

October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2025  
Gurpreet Singh

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