



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

128

CRM-M-9967-2023

Date of decision: July 17th, 2025

Ved Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Ramesh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Lekh Raj Nandal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Prayer in the instant petition is for setting aside the order dated 14.12.2017 passed by learned SDJM, Gohana, District Sonipat, whereby the complaint filed by the petitioner i.e. Complaint No.166/2016 titled as 'Ved Singh Versus Ramesh and others' has been dismissed, revision against which preferred by the petitioner has also been dismissed vide order dated 09.12.2022 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonipat.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has vehemently contended that both the Courts below erred in dismissing the complaint filed by the petitioner (complainant) without properly appreciating the evidence led by him. Learned counsel has further drawn the attention of this Court to the contents of the complaint (Annexure P-1) and submitted that the respondents, in connivance with one another, allegedly prepared a false affidavit. It has been contended that on the strength of such false affidavit, respondent No.3, who was then serving as a Patwari, sanctioned the mutation in favour of

respondent Nos.1 and 2.

3. It is further submitted that the learned Courts below failed to consider the report submitted by the SHO concerned under Section 202 of the Cr.P.C., which, according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, supports the claim that the land in question rightfully belongs to the petitioner. Learned counsel further alleges that the respondents had entered into a conspiracy to forge and fabricate documents in order to fraudulently secure the mutation in their favour. On these grounds, it is prayed that the impugned orders passed by the learned trial Court dismissing the complaint filed by the petitioner as well as the order of the learned Revisional Court upholding the orders of the learned trial Court be set aside, and a direction be instead issued for registration of a FIR against the respondents.

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

5. On a careful consideration of the matter, this Court finds no illegality, irregularity or perversity in the concurrent findings recorded by the learned trial Court as well as the learned Revisional Court. The record reveals that the complaint filed by the petitioner has already been duly adjudicated and dismissed at two levels, and the petitioner has failed to demonstrate any error of law or fact which would warrant interference in the exercise of inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS/482 of the Cr.P.C.

6. It is also not disputed that the relief sought in the present petition-seeking a direction to the SHO to register a case-is founded upon the very same allegations that have already been considered and rejected by the Courts below. Permitting such a course would amount to

a second round of litigation on identical facts, which is not permissible in law.

7. In the absence of any cogent material to establish a manifest miscarriage of justice or abuse of the process of law, this Court is not inclined to issue directions as prayed for.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

9. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

July 17th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No