

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

CRM No.M-6037of 2016

Date of Decision: February 18, 2016

Smt. Kanta

.... Petitioner

vs.

Gajanand and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Ahluwalia, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 09.12.2013 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Charkhi Dadri, vide which the complaint filed by Shyam Lal, predecessor of the petitioner was dismissed after recording pre-charge evidence holding that offence under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC are not made out. Consequently, accused was discharged and the revision filed before the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Bhiwani was dismissed on 05.11.2015 (Annexure P-3).

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the case file.

There are concurrent findings of two courts below that from the pre-charge evidence led by the petitioner, the offences are not made out. The dispute in this case is whether the document in question is an agreement to sell or sale itself. However, the allegations are of cheating and forgery, which are not made out from

the evidence led by the petitioner. Thus, there is no ground to interfere in the concurrent findings of facts recorded by two courts below.

Hence, the present petition stands disposed of.

February 18, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE