

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

**CRM-M-26816-2022
Date of decision: 18.11.2022**

Rajbala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Kumar Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Lalit Narang, Advocate,
Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate and
Mr. Mohit Kakkar, Advocate
for respondent Nos. 4 to 8.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for issuance of directions to the official respondents to file the status of the application dated 17.05.2022, filed by the petitioner for taking action against the private respondents.

Reply, filed by way of Additional Superintendent of Police, Rohtak, is on record, wherein it is stated that during the course of enquiry, respondent Nos. 4 to 8 were also joined in enquiry and they have made a statement that they are the owners of the land in question and the petitioner, with an intention to grab their land, has moved false complaint to the police. It is also stated that the Investigating Officer has collected the revenue record, according to which, vide sale deed No. 1273 dated 04.05.2022, the private respondents have sold 10 Kanal 08 Marlas of land to one Pardeep Singh and the mutation No. 4701 has already been sanctioned in favour of

Pardeep Singh. It is further stated that the petitioner was also joined in the enquiry and she has made a statement that her brother-in-law Bal Kishan has given Rs. 3,00,000/- to respondent Nos. 4 and 5, Chander Ram and Wazir, and they have sold the land to the petitioner in 2005, however, they are not executing the sale deed but the petitioner could not produce any document in support of her claim.

It is further stated in reply that the petitioner has alleged in her complaint that the private respondents have sold the land to her on 10.10.2015 for a sum of Rs. 23,50,000/- but she has made a contradictory statement before the police that her brother-in-law Bal Kishan has given Rs. 3,00,000/- to respondent Nos. 4 and 5. It is concluded in the enquiry that since the petitioner has failed to produce any document regarding purchase of the land, the dispute is of the civil nature and accordingly, the complaint of the petitioner was filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner could not dispute the aforesaid facts.

In view of the same, no further action is called for in the present petition and the same is disposed of.

18.11.2022

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No