

ITEM NO.24

COURT NO.7

SECTION II-B

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 S

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRIMINAL) Diary No(s).7671/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 25-03-2025 in CRMM No. 19117/2024 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

RANDHAWA CONSTRUCTIONS PRIVATE LIMITED

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION and I.R.

IA No. 69557/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING

IA No. 69559/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 69556/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 20-03-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Jeetender Gupta, AOR
Mr. Bharat Rawat, Adv.
Mr. Kushagra Gupta, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

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

1. Delay condoned.
2. Heard Mr. Jeetender Gupta, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner (original complainant).
3. It appears from the materials on record that the petitioner lodged the First Information Report bearing no.109 dated 03.03.2022 with the Sohana City Police Station, Gurugram for the offence punishable under Sections 120-B, 406, 420,

447, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code (for short, "the IPC").

4. The petitioner has levelled allegations of criminal conspiracy, criminal breach of trust, etc. in relation to the alleged forgery of a Board resolution dated 22.04.2019.

5. At the end of the investigation, police filed a closure report. After the closure report was filed, an application came to be preferred by the petitioner for further investigation under Section 173(8) of the Cr.P.C.

6. The court concerned declined to order further investigation. The application seeking further investigation was treated to be one as a protest petition.

7. The protest petition is pending as on date before the Trial Court.

8. While the protest petition was pending, the petitioner thought fit to challenge the order passed by the Trial Court declining to order further investigation in the High Court. The High Court also declined to interfere and, accordingly, dismissed the petition.

9. In such circumstances, the petitioner is here before us with the present petition.

10. We are of the view that the protest petition which is now pending before the Trial Court should be looked into on its own merits, without being influenced in any manner by any of the observations made by the High Court in its impugned judgment and order.

11. If the petitioner wants to file a revised protest

petition, he may do so in accordance with law.

12. Let the parties be heard now on the protest petition and an appropriate decision be taken in that regard at the earliest.

13. With the aforesaid, the Special Leave Petition stands disposed of.

14. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET KAUR)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)