

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-40593 of 2015

Date of decision: February 09, 2016.

Brij Lal

... **Petitioner**

v.

Pawan Kumar and others

... **Respondents**

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

Present: Mr. Abhinav Sood, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

None for the respondents.

1. *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *Whether 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 3.10.2015 (Anexure P-4) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal affirming the order dated 22.2.2014 (Annexure P-2) passed by Judicial Magistrate First Class, Karnal, vide which, in a criminal complaint under Sections 406, 420, 423, 467, 468, 120-B, 34 IPC filed by the present petitioner-complainant, only accused No.1 was summoned under Sections 406 and 420 IPC and the complaint against accused No.2 to 7 was dismissed.

I have heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner.

It comes out that as per the allegations made in the

complaint, accused No.1 had entered into an agreement to sell with

the complainant but subsequently sold the land to accused No.2 and 3. The other accused are witnesses to the agreement to sell and subsequent sale deed of the land in question.

After going through the facts, I am of the view that no prima facie case is made out against the remaining accused, therefore, there is no illegality or perversity in the impugned orders of the courts below.

No merit.

Dismissed.

February 09, 2016.
kadyan

[Kuldip Singh]
Judge