

114

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M No. 36751 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.11.2023**

M/s. PEEESS Construction Company, Rohtak

..... Petitioner

Versus

Sunita

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Sauhard Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for quashing of the order dated 21.08.2017 (Annexure P-3) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak, whereby the revision petition filed at the instance of respondent-revisionist / Sunita against the summoning order dated 29.07.2016 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rohtak (for short "Revisional Court"), was allowed.

[2] In the present case, a perusal of the order dated 29.07.2016 passed by the Revisional Court shows that the business transactions were apparently between the petitioner and one Inderjeet, who happened to be the husband of respondent; thus, there was no question of entrustment being made to the respondent. Moreover, originally the complaint was filed against the respondent, her husband and son, though summoning order was passed only against the respondent-Sunita, whereas the remaining two, i.e. her husband and son, namely, Inderjeet and Rahul @ Rocky were not summoned

by the trial Court vide its order dated 29.07.2016 and yet the said order was never assailed by the petitioner.

[3] In view of the above, finding no illegality or perversity with the order dated 21.08.2017 (P-3) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak, which is based on proper appreciation of facts and material available on record, present petition is hereby **dismissed**.

November 30, 2023
'dk kamra'

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>