

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Cr.M.No.M-10424 of 2015 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 10.7.2015

Rita Rani and another

PETITIONERS

VERSUS

State of Punjab

RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

1. Whether reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present:- None for the petitioners.

Shri Premjit S.Hundal, A.A.G. Punjab.

Shri Jaideep Verma, Advocate for the complainant.

MAHESH GROVER, J.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioners despite the fact that the case was called out repeatedly during the course of the day.

I have perused the petition with the assistance of the counsel for the State as also the complainant.

The facts indicate that petitioner No.1 along with her husband had

created a deceitful web to hoodwink the complainant who is an 80 years old woman. Petitioner No.1 and her husband who are related to the complainant, persuaded her to sell off 40 kanals of land on the pretext that they would purchase a house where she could reside in her old age.

On 9.2.2012, the land was sold and on 17.2.2012, the sale deed was registered and it was projected to the complainant that it has been purchased in her name, whereas the facts were otherwise. It was purchased in the name of Sandeep Kumar, husband of petitioner No.1. A joint account was also kept by petitioner No.1 along with the complainant and an amount of Rs.10 lacs was deposited in it which was withdrawn by petitioner No.1

On due consideration of the matter and noticing the fact that there is sufficient material to indicate that fraud has been played upon by petitioner No.1 along with her husband upon the complainant and the serious nature of the allegations where the complainant has been duped of the entire land and the sale proceeds, and also the fact that husband of petitioner No.1 is now embarking upon the process to even force the complainant out of the house by proclaiming himself to be the owner, I am of the opinion that the petition deserves to be dismissed. Ordered accordingly. The police authorities are directed to arrest petitioner No.1 forthwith and carry out the investigation by taking it to its logical end, as expeditiously, as possible.

Since petitioner No.2 is an accomplice and an active participant, the petition qua him is also dismissed.

July 10, 2015
GD

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE