



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

CRM-M No.4582 of 2025
Date of decision: 29th January, 2025

Amarjeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. N.S. Sodhi, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking quashing of order dated 24.12.2024 (Annexure P-1) whereby the revision petition filed by the respondent No.2 has been allowed setting aside the order dated 07.10.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the impugned order, annexed as Annexure P-1, passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fazilka is erroneous. It has been further contended that the petitioner Amarjeet Singh, is the rightful owner of the vehicle in question, having purchased it on loan and paid all its installments to date. Further, learned counsel has asserted that the respondent No.2 Jagtinder Singh, who had worked as a driver for the petitioner, expressed an intention to take over the car along with the loan. It is also submitted that an affidavit detailing the terms and conditions of this arrangement was executed between the petitioner and

respondent No.2, but despite repeated reminders, respondent No.2 failed to comply with the terms.

3. It has been further submitted that subsequently respondent No.2 informed the petitioner that he was unable to repay the amount due to financial losses. As a result, the possession of the vehicle was peacefully taken by the petitioner.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

5. On a specific query posed to learned counsel for the petitioner regarding whether the petitioner has denied the execution of an affidavit with respondent No.2 at the time of filing of the sapurdari application before learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jalalabad, learned counsel categorically stated in the negative. However, a perusal of Annexure P-2 clearly indicates that the petitioner had categorically denied the execution of any such affidavit.

6. In view of the contradictory stand taken by the petitioner and the facts and circumstances of the case, no interference is warranted with the impugned order (Annexure P-1). Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

January 29, 2025
rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No