

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

CRM-M-10001 of 2017

Date of Decision: 26.04.2017

Kashmir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ashok Giri, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Mehta, Additional Advocate General, Punjab,
with ASI Vijay Kumar,
for respondent No.1.

None for respondent No.2.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The allegation against the petitioner is that he facilitated the agreement of sale between the complainant and the three persons stating that they were owners of a particular piece of land, but subsequently it turned out that the persons whom he introduced the complainant to, were not owners of the land.

As per the learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Vijay Kumar, the petitioner was not in any position to facilitate any such agreement, with one of the owners being behind bars on the alleged date of the agreement, the second one being in Canada and the third one having admitted that he had not entered into any such agreement.

Though learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has returned Rs.16 lacs to the complainant in cash and has also paid him cheques of Rs.6 lacs each, the learned counsel for the State, on

instructions, denies any such payment of Rs.16 lacs.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner, prima facie, at least introduced the complainant to the persons who were not owners of the land, the status of as to where the actual owners were, becomes meaningless. Hence, I see no reason to entertain this petition.

Dismissed.

The interim order is vacated.

26.04.2017
adhikari/rajneesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes/no

Whether reportable: Yes/no