



CRM-M-41013-2025

- 1 -

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

120

**CRM-M-41013-2025
Decided on : 23.09.2025**

Mandir Samanath Narsing Puri Parhlad Puri

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Saksham Khunger, Advocate for the petitioner.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS Act, seeking quashing of the order dated 29.03.2025 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Fatehabad, whereby revision petition challenging the order dated 05.09.2022 was dismissed. Further, petitioner also seeks quashing of the order dated 05.09.2022 passed by learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Tohana, whereby the application for additional evidence filed by petitioner-complainant was dismissed.

2. Petitioner, who is the complainant, has alleged that accused Iqbal was given the agricultural land for cultivation and maintenance. However, he subsequently sublet the land in question and altered its nature. In fact, accused Iqbal Singh transferred possession of the land to other



accused persons, who further changed its nature by constructing a Gaushala.

3. The application dated 17.08.2022 (P/1) seeking permission to produce original/certified copies of the Khasra Girdawri was perused, but it did not specify the year for which the Girdawri or Jamabandi records were required to be brought on record. For this reason, among others, the application was dismissed.

4. It was noticed that during the investigation, Investigating Officer collected the revenue records of the land in question and included the Patwaris, Ram Niwas and Prabhu Ram, in the investigation. The Jamabandi for the year 2011-12 (Ex. P-1) and the Khasra Girdawri for the years 2012-2014 (Ex. P-2) were already on record. These Patwaris were examined and duly proved the revenue records collected by the Investigating Officer.

5. Despite the rejection of the application for additional evidence, petitioner filed a revision petition. However, revision petition also failed to specify the year for which the documents such as Girdawri were sought to be brought on record. The learned Revisional Court, in paragraph 9 of its order, observed as follows:

“9. It will be apt to mention here that vide order dated 17.01.2015, the accused were charged for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 420, 447, 506 read with Section 120B IPC. It will not be out of place to mention here that jamabandi as Ex.Pl. of the suit land is on the record evidencing nature of the suit land as agricultural, whereas khasra girdawari for the years 2012 to 2014 show that



the nature of the land in dispute stood changed in the year 2014 but the fact remains that the learned counsel for the revisionist admittedly alongwith application dated 17.08.2022 referred above did not annex any revenue document sought to be produced by way of additional evidence, therefore in the absence thereof it is not possible for this Court to appreciate those documents and their necessity for effective adjudication of the matter.”

6. This Court does not find any illegality in the order dismissing the application or the reasons assigned therein. Moreover, it appears that the petitioner, being the complainant, is somewhat confused as to what he intends to prove and for which particular period. Furthermore, since this is an FIR case where the investigation has already been completed, allowing such a vague prayer at this stage may cause prejudice to the rights of the accused. Accordingly, present petition is hereby dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Septemeber 23, 2025

rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No