

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G SPetition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 1592/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 21-01-2026 in CRM-M No. 1360/2026 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

RAJESH @ RAJESH MALIK

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 27880/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 27883/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 19-05-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.V. ANJARIA

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Ajay Jain, Adv.
Mr. Jinendra Jain, AOR
Mr. Krishna Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Shreya Jain, Adv.
Mr. M.n. Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Manoj Gautam, Adv.
Ms. Bijay Lakshmi, Adv.
Ms. Kashish Gupta, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Shekhar Raj Sharma, A.A.G.
Mr. Akshay Amritanshu, AOR
Ms. Nidhi Narwal, Adv.
Ms. Srishti Jain, Adv.
Mr. Sarthak Srivastava, Adv.

Mr. Umang Shankar, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Petitioner and the second respondent's wife entered

into a sale agreement on 18.07.2024 whereby petitioner agreed to sell his property to the informant at Rs. 4.11 crore and he received advance amount of Rs. 60,00,000/- (Rupees Sixty Lakh only).

2. When the deal did not materialize and the petitioner did not return the amount to the informant, the present FIR No. 816 of 2025, registered at Police Station Chandni Bagh, District Panipat, for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4) & 61 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 was lodged in which petitioner's anticipatory bail application was rejected by the High Court under the impugned order.

3. On 29.01.2026, we had granted interim bail to the petitioner. Thereafter, the parties entered into a negotiations and on 09.04.2026, learned counsel for second respondent agreed that if his wife, Ms. Manjeet Kaur, is paid back the amount of Rs. 60,00,000/- (Rupees Sixty Lakh only), he will withdraw the subject FIR and this court may quash the FIR in exercise of powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India.

4. In course of hearing today, Mr. Neeraj Jain, learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of second respondent, on instructions, would submit that the petitioner has already paid an amount of Rs. 60,00,000/- (Rupees Sixty Lakh only) to the wife of second respondent from an account in the name of M/s Neha Enterprises, however, he submits that the second respondent's wife is satisfied with the amount irrespective of the account from which it is paid.

5. Learned counsel for the parties would submit that the petitioner has preferred a suit seeking decree for forfeiture of the amount of Rs. 60,00,000/- (Rupees Sixty Lakh only) which he has received as advance at the time of agreement.

6. The parties would also agree that since the amount of Rs. 60,00,000/- (Rupees Sixty Lakh only) had already been returned, the suit No. 1832 of 2025 pending in the court of Civil Judge, Senior Division, Panipat has been rendered infructuous.

7. In view of the above and since the parties have agreed, we invoke our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India and quash the FIR No. 816 of 2025, registered at Police Station Chandni Bagh, District Panipat, for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4) & 61 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and also the proceedings in Civil Suit No. 1832 of 2025, pending in the court of Civil Judge (Senior Division), Panipat.

8. The parties shall inform the concerned police station and the concerned Civil Court where the FIR and the suit respectively are pending.

9. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) may be directed to rectify the mistake in the revenue records in respect of the subject property.

10. Since the said aspect of the matter is not arising between the parties who have entered into a compromise in

this Special Leave Petition, we leave it to the concerned authority to take appropriate proceedings, if the petitioner moves an application in this regard. In such eventuality, the petitioner's application shall be decided on its own merits without being influenced by any observation made in this order.

11. In view of the above, the Special Leave Petition stands disposed of.

12. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(RAHUL KUMAR)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(AKSHAY KUMAR BHORIA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)