

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

**CRM-M-9136-2017
Date of decision-05.04.2017**

**Ravinder Singh and others
Vs.
State of Punjab**

...Petitioners

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of order dated 11.04.2016 (Annexure P-4) passed by Judicial Magistrate First Class, Ludhiana vide which charges have been framed against the petitioner in FIR No.7 dated 15.01.2015 registered under Sections 406, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Dehlon, District Ludhiana and order dated 06.02.2017 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana (Annexure P-5) vide which the revision petition filed by the petitioner has been dismissed.

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioner No.1 and petitioner No.2 have not been named in the FIR and that there is no evidence against petitioner No.3 in the charge-sheet.

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

It is to be noticed that the trial Court has framed charge against the petitioners after *prima facie* evaluation of the evidence. It has come in

the evidence that petitioner No.3, namely, Tara Singh in conspiracy with petitioner No.1, namely, Ravinder Singh and petitioner No.2, namely, Sandeep Singh, had duped the complainant Suraj Jyoti and one Rajiv Sharma of a sum of ₹45 lakh. The complainant was interested in purchasing his neighbour-Paramjit Singh's land which was adjoining his land. Tara Singh claimed that he could get Paramjit Singh to sell that land to the complainant and took Rs.1 lac as token money but the money was returned on the pretext that Paramjit Singh wanted to sell the land at a higher price. Thereafter, Tara Singh approached the complainant saying that Parmajit Singh was in need of money and was willing to sell the land. This deal was finalised through Sikander Singh, maternal uncle of Paramjit Singh. The negotiations between complainant and Sikander Singh were arranged with the intervention of Tara Singh and agreement was scribed in the presence of Tara Singh, Sikander Singh, Paramjit Singh, Numberdar Amrik Singh and other accused. Later, it was revealed that petitioner No.2 Sandeep Singh had posed as Amrik Singh and petitioner No.1 Ravinder Singh had posed as Sikander Singh.

There are direct and specific allegations against all three petitioners. Moreover, at the time of framing of charge, *prima facie* a case is to be seen which stands made out in the present case.

Consequently, finding no merit, the present petition is dismissed.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

April 05, 2017

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No