

131.

2025:PHHC:041849



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

CRM-M-16457-2025

Date of decision: 26.03.2025

Juber Khan Pathan

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Mohd. Uzair, Advocate, for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No.11, dated 21.04.2023, registered under Sections 420, 406, 419, 120-B of IPC, Police Station Cyber Jhajjar, and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has neither been named in the FIR nor has any amount been transferred to the petitioner's account. It is further submitted that the police is trying to falsely implicate the petitioner in the present case due to personal enmity between the father of the petitioner and certain local individuals.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that on 21.09.2024, officials of Police Station Cyber, Jhajjar, with the assistance of the local police of Police Station Mandal, Bhilwara, conducted an unlawful raid at the residence of the petitioner during his absence, purportedly in search of one Lalit Mewara, who resides within the jurisdiction of Police Station Mandal. During the said raid, the police personnel allegedly

demanded a bribe of Rs.10 lakhs from the wife of the petitioner. It is submitted that, in response to this incident, the petitioner lodged an online complaint on the same day against the concerned police officials, alleging misconduct and demand of illegal gratification. Hence, it was in this background that the petitioner was now being sought to be implicated in the present case.

4. I have heard learned counsel and perused the material placed on record.

5. The contentions of the petitioner regarding the purported intention of the police to implicate him in the FIR in question due to personal enmity between his father and certain local individuals involve disputed questions of fact. Such issues require adjudication upon the proper appreciation of evidence and cannot be determined at this stage.

6. Moreover, it is pertinent to note that the investigation in the present case is still at a nascent stage, and the charge-sheet has yet to be filed. At this juncture, this Court does not deem it appropriate to exercise its jurisdiction to quash the FIR in question against the petitioner.

7. Present petition stands dismissed accordingly.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

March 26, 2025

sanjeev

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