

**137 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM No.M-26713 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: April 05, 2016

Sanjeev Kumar and another **Petitioners**

VS.

Randhir Singh and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Ms. Ekta Thakur, Advocate for the petitioners.

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?

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Impugned in the present petition is the order dated 04.09.2014 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Chandigarh, vide which the complaint filed by the present petitioner under Section 420 read with Section 120-B IPC was dismissed after recording the preliminary evidence. Also impugned is the order dated 24.04.2015 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Chandigarh, whereby the revision against the said order was dismissed.

Heard.

It comes out that the allegations in the complaint are that the complainant was the owner of the disputed property and that accused No.1 had no right or title to sell the same to accused No.2. Accused Nos.3 and 4 are witnesses of the said sale deed.

I am of the view that if the sale deed has been executed by accused No.1, it is the buyer, who has been cheated and not the

complainant. It is evident that there is a civil dispute between the parties. It being so, there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned orders passed by both the Courts below.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

April 05, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE