

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

**CRM-M No. 30011 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.11.2015**

Ravneet Pal Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Anil Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mikhail Kad, AAG, Punjab
for respondent Nos. 1 to 3/State.

Mr. H.S. Gill, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Vivek Goyal, Advocate
for respondent No 4.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner being a sole proprietor of M/s. Sukhmani Tyres was inducted as a tenant in the demise shop vide rent note dated 01.01.2009, executed between M/s. Sukhmani Tyres and the complainant/landlord-Smt. Manjit Kaur (complainant/respondent No. 4 herein).

It is the case of the complainant that in the original rent note, Clause-9 read as under:-

“That this rent deed is valid for the period of eleven months, but the same can be extended with the consent of both the parties.”

However, the petitioner-accused in a fraudulently manner, tampered with the said clause by adding of four more lines which now read as under:-

“That this rent deed is valid for the period of eleven months, but the same can be extended with the consent of both the

parties. The tenancy or possession can be extended by the successor or assignee by the tenant (party of the 1st part) at any time. Hence in the presence of the witness, this Rent Deed has been executed at Ludhiana, on the day date and year as aforesaid."

The above variance has surfaced in the investigation.

It is also admitted that after the execution of aforesaid rent note, the petitioner has inducted Jatinder Kumar as co-tenant by virtue of a partnership deed dated 31.03.2009 (Annexure P-2).

Petitioner has filed present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing the FIR No. 41, dated 19.03.2011 (**Annexure P-5**) for offences punishable under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sadar, District Ludhiana, on the ground that entire dispute is of civil nature and the aforesaid FIR has been filed to harass him.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

On examination the police file, this Court has examined both the photocopy of original rent note, as also the tampered note, *prima facie*, there appears to be clear-cut additions of four lines as aforesaid. Even otherwise, it is conceded that the petitioner is a proclaimed offender. Therefore, no case for interference is made out.

The present petition is accordingly dismissed.

November 17, 2015

'dk kamra'

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE