



CRM-M-35985-2024

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

CRM-M-35985-2024

Date of Decision: 01.07.2025

Rahul Mehra

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Harkaran Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, A.A.G., Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

1. Seeking initiation of action under Section 340 CrPC against respondents No. 5 to 8 for concealing facts and filing false affidavit in this Court in CRM-M No. 30260 of 2024 by filing quashing compromise petition dated 18.12.2021 and procuring an order Annexure P-1, the petitioner had come up before this court under 482 read with 340 CrPC.

2. Petitioner's grievance is that they had filed an FIR against the private respondents. After filing of the FIR, they got massive pressure from private respondents and even police officials. Respondents No. 5 to 8 lodged various fake complaints against the petitioner, but after inquiry all were cancelled or became infructuous. Petitioner's grievance is that respondent No.5 is keeping a grudge against them and as such is filing false cases. Respondent No.7 entered into the house of the children who were studying in the school and threatened them to hand over the papers. Petitioner's grievance is that respondents No. 5 to 8 are very influential and respondent No.4 is acting at their instance. Even after registration of FIR, nothing substantive has been done. In other portions of the present petition, numerous facts have been mentioned which have nothing to do with the relief under 340 CrPC, as such this Court is not referring to all of them.

3. Petitioner's grievance for filing the present petition is in paragraph No. 18 wherein he stated that respondents no.5 to 8 filed CRM-M No. 30260 of 2024 based on a compromise and used old compromise to get the order of the recording of the statement and when he got to know, he filed an application for dismissal of the petition and on



CRM-M-35985-2024

30.09.2024 quashing petition was withdrawn. Thus the private respondents tried to mislead this Court by using an old affidavit as genuine and in case the petitioner had not intervened, they could have befooled the Court. Based on this allegation, the petitioner seeks inquiry under Section 340 CrPC.

4. Even if all the allegations made by the petitioner in the complaint are taken as gospel truth, still the fact remains that respondents were unable to procure any relief even in the quashing petition based on the compromise. When the matter was referred to the Magistrate, he would have inquired into the genuineness of compromise and in case the compromise was fake, certainly no report suggesting the compromise to be genuine would have been sent by the concerned Magistrate. Thus it appears that the present petition is a tool to further complicate the matter and it can be inferred from the petition itself that there are multiple complaints filed by both the parties against each other and this Court is convinced that this is also one such complaint.

5. In the entirety of facts and circumstances, no case is made out to initiate inquiry under Section 340 CrPC or issue notice to private respondents.

6. Petition dismissed. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

01.07.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.