



CRM-M-15631-2014

252

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**CRM-M-15631-2014  
Decided on: 23.07.2025

Gurbir Singh Grewal

...Petitioner

Versus

Pirthipal Singh etc.

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Rajinder K. Singla, Advocate  
for the petitioner.Mr. J.S.Toor, APP, U.T. Chandigarh and  
Mr. Adhiraj Toor, Advocate  
for respondent No.2-U.T. Chandigarh

\*\*\*\*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

1. Seeking launch of prosecution by filing criminal complaint under sections 193, 199, 200, 205, 209, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, and 120 of Indian Penal Code 1860, against respondent No.1 for producing false and forged documents supported by affidavit in CRM-M-876 of 2014 titled as Pirthipal Singh Grewal vs. State of Punjab, decided on 27th January 2014, petitioner had come up before this court u/s 340 CrPC r/w 482 CrPC in the year 2014.

2. The petitioner alleges that his father-Joginder Singh along with respondent No.1 had purchased a plot of 5000 square yards. During their lifetime, a partition had taken place between them. The details of partition have been mentioned in para No.2 to 4 of the petition and it is unnecessary to refer to all such details, because that is not the main subject matter of controversy.

3. Thereafter, a litigation started between the parties. A civil suit was filed, in which parties were directed to maintain status quo qua possession and alienation vide order dated 23rd September, 1995, till the final disposal of the suit.

4. After that, a civil revision was filed before this Court and on 26th March 2001, an order was passed by a coordinate bench of this court, whereby the said revision petition was disposed of. Respondent No.1 on one pretext or the other started delaying the matter and vide order dated 8th July 2011 passed in Civil Revision No. 4101 of 2011, this Court directed the trial Code to dispose of the civil suit within six months vide Annexure P11.



CRM-M-15631-2014

Later on, the suit was dismissed on 3rd April 2012 and an appeal was filed by respondent No.1, which ended in compromise.

5. During pendency of the suit, in active involvement with staff of Municipal Corporation, Ludhiana, they got transferred the property in the municipal record, the entire 5000 squares of land, in violation of the stay order dated 26th March 2001. The petitioner brought this fact to the notice of this court, by filing the contempt petition, which was disposed of with the direction that the transfer of property shall be subject to the final outcome of the civil suit (Annexure P12).

6. After that an application was filed for correction of girdawari. The petitioner's grievance is that respondent No.1 had filed a false and frivolous petition bearing number CRM-M- 876 of 2014 against the present petitioner and his brothers and police officials asking for registration of FIR for Commission of offences punishable under Sections 427, 430, 452, 457, 395 IPC read with 120B IPC (Annexure P16) supported by affidavit.

7. In the said petition, the petitioner had fabricated and forged Khasra girdawari (Annexure P-13) after making cuttings and alterations to show his possession and reflect sown bajra crop for the kharif season of 2013. The copy of such document was annexed as Annexure P18. However, the said petition was disposed of vide order dated 27.01.2014 by a Co-ordinate branch of this Court.

8. I have heard counsel for both the parties and have gone through the pleadings and its analysis would lead to the following outcome.

9. The short question involved in this case is that the respondent had approached this Court by filing a petition under Section 482 CrPC seeking directions for registration of FIR. Vide order dated 27th January 2014 passed in CRM-M-876 of 2014, a Coordinate branch of this Court after passing a detailed order, had disposed of the petition by observing to follow the judgement of Constitutional bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P. and others (Writ petition (Criminal) No.68 of 2008)***, ***Manu/SC/1166/2013*** and other judicial precedents were also mentioned. Consequently, petitioners were given liberty to avail appropriate remedy in accordance with law. It was clarified that the observations in the order would not be construed as an expression on the merits of the allegations set up by the petitioners and nor the Court had adverted itself to the issue, even if the allegations do or do not constitute any cognizable offence.

10. Even if all the allegations made by the petitioner are accepted on the face value, still the fact remains that the respondent-Gurbir Singh Grewal did not get any effective relief from this Court in petition bearing number CRM-M- 876 of 2014. The order which was only apprising and informing the petitioner about availability of his legal rights, especially in Lalita Kumari's case (supra) and asking them to consider approaching the



CRM-M-15631-2014

appropriate authorities in accordance with law. Even if this order had not come, the respondent-Pirthipal Singh had all the legal rights to file a fresh petition in accordance with the judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court. Thus, no effective gain was achieved by him by filing the petition. The question regarding fabrication of documents is subject to evidence and this Court does not consider it appropriate to proceed by ordering an inquiry to inquire into the fabrication and forging of evidence for the reason that the respondent Pirthipal Singh Grewal did not achieve anything by filing the petition CRM-M-876 of 2014.

11. It is clear that the parties are litigating over a piece of land where the value of land has gone up and 'N' number of times in big cities, especially in this part of India. In addition to the value of the property, it appears to be a case of inflated egos between the parties to settle their scores also by involving the courts, and this Court would not like to be played at the hands of the litigants who want to achieve their purposes and not to serve the cause of justice.

12. Given above in the entirety of facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, it is not a case to proceed under Section 340 CrPC and the petition is dismissed. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

23.07.2025  
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether reportable: No.