

203

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-24909 of 2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: January 31, 2024

Vikrant Singla @ Vikkrant Singla

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present:- Mr. G.S. Madaan, Advocate and
Mr. Anshul Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG Haryana

Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate
for respondent No. 2

Harpreet Singh Brar, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No. 127 dated 22.03.2022 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Central Faridabad, District Faridabad and all consequential proceedings arisen therefrom.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the genesis of the dispute is agreement to sell dated 02.04.2021 and it is purely a civil dispute, which has been maliciously converted into a criminal case and that too on wrong facts. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon order dated 21.12.2021 (Annexure P-10) passed by Civil Judge (Junior Division) Faridabad to contend that the learned trial Court has granted interim stay in favour of the petitioner and respondent No. 2 had been directed not to alienate the suit property during the pendency of the suit filed by the petitioner.

Crl. Misc. No. M-24909 of 2023 (O&M)

-2-

3. Per contra learned State counsel submits that the charges have been framed and the trial is progressing. Three Prosecution witnesses have been examined.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 submits that perusal of interim order passed by this Court on 19.05.2023 indicates that the reliance is placed upon the FSL report and it was projected that the agreement to sell in question is not a forged document rather the FSL indicates that the agreement to sell has been signed by respondent No. 2/complainant. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 has referred to the FSL report available on record as Annexure A-2 with the application filed by the complainant and a conclusive finding has been recorded with regard to agreement to sell being forged and fabricated as the same does not bear the signatures of respondent No. 2/complainant.

5. In view of the facts and circumstance of the case, this Court can not appreciate the disputed question of facts and appreciate the defence set up by the petitioners.

6. The petition is dismissed.

7. However, nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and trial court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

January 31, 2024

reena

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No