

135

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-958 of 2016 (O/M)

Date of decision : 4.4.2016

Amar Singh Sapra

..... Petitioner

Versus

Darshan Kumar

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Arvind Rajotia, Advocate, for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?
- .- -.-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has impugned the order dated 26.5.2014 (Annexure-P-1), passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Hisar, vide which his complaint, filed under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC was dismissed after recording the preliminary evidence. The said order was upheld by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar on 2.2.2015 (Annexure-P-2).

Heard.

It comes out that there was an agreement of sale between the parties. Later on, the sale deed was not executed and extension of time and execution of the sale deed was sought. According to the complainant, he was misled that an application for extension of time has been filed, which was infact not filed. It was

CRM No. M-958 of 2016 (O/M)

also not disputed that the suit for specific performance has been filed, which has been decreed. Basically, it is a question of enforcement of the agreement, which is a civil dispute. Therefore, there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned orders. Hence, the present petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

4.4.2016
sjks