

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**Criminal Appeal No. \_\_\_\_\_ of 2025  
(@ Special Leave Petition (Crl) No.6639 of  
2023)**

**Chandrashekar C**

**...Appellant**

**Versus**

**The State of Karnataka & Anr.**

**...Respondent(s)**

**O R D E R**

Leave granted.

**2.** The 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in the appeal, the complainant, alleged that a series of transactions at the behest of persons arrayed as accused numbers 1 & 2 deprived him of the lands owned by him, the consideration of which was syphoned off. The allegation was not only against A-1 & A-2 but also against the so-called purchasers who were arrayed as accused nos. 5 to 95 and 124 to 139.

**3.** Many accused jointly, and the present appellant and another separately filed applications to quash the complaint which was unsuccessful before the High Court. In the present appeal, the appellant alone, who was arrayed as A-22, impugns the order of the High Court on the facts particular to him. Insofar as the appellant herein is concerned, he had purchased a site bearing Nos. 24 and 25 in Survey No. 4 of Beretena Agrahara Village, Begur Hubli, Bengaluru South Taluk from the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent under a registered sale deed dated 30.01.2020 for a total consideration of Rs.44,40,000/- (Rupees forty four lakhs and forty thousand) A rectification deed was also executed to correct the boundaries, to make it in accordance with the actual boundaries on the ground, which was dated 16.03.2020. The appellant's contention is that the entire consideration has been paid.

**4.** We heard Shri Siddharth Agarwal, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant and Shri Shoeb

Alam, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent. We also heard Shri Nishant Patil, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the State.

**5.** This Court on being apprised of the facts relating to the complaint against the appellant herein, directed the State, a neutral entity insofar as the allegations are concerned, to submit a report regarding the allegations made especially on the stand taken by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent that the signatures in the sale deed and the rectification deed was forged and fabricated. The report was directed to be placed before this Court in a sealed cover by the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Central Crime Branch (CCB), Bangalore City, Karnataka. Pursuant to this Court's order dated 11.11.2025, on 02.12.2025, a report was filed which was silent regarding the rectification deed. Dissatisfied with the report, the Deputy Commissioner of Police who conducted the enquiry, was directed to be present.

**6.** Today, the Deputy Commissioner of Police is present and a report has been filed from which paras 10, 11 and 12 are extracted:

***“10.*** *Pertaining to the said sale-deed dated 30.01.2020 of the petitioner, a rectification deed dated 16.03.2020 has been executed for rectification of schedule/boundaries of the purchased site numbers 24 and 25, between the petitioner and the Complainant/R-02. It is submitted that as the complainant/R-02 in his statement has admitted of having executed the above referred sale-deed dated 30.01.2020 and rectification deed dated 16.03.2020, including his thumb impression & presence in the office of Sub-Registrar, the said documents have not been sent for further forensic analysis. It is revealed during investigation that there is no infirmity with the execution of the sale deed dated 30.01.2020 and rectification deed dated 16.03.2020 pertaining to the petitioner.*

***11.*** *Accused Naveen Kumar (A-02) who was absconding for more two years was*

*arrested on 08.11.2025 and the investigation is continuing in this case.*

**12.** *The investigation in the present case is partially complete and the chargesheet filed on 29.05.2025 against five accused persons is preliminary/initial chargesheet. The investigation is still continuing as against A-1 to A-21, A-23 to A-52, A-54 to A-141. In the present case FSL reports are awaited, investigation into money trail is continuing. Based on the investigation conducted so far, the investigation officer has informed the undersigned that he is not intending to chargesheet the Petitioner in the present case."*

**7.** Shri Shoeb Alam, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, however, would point out that total sale consideration of only about Rs.9,00,000/- (Rupees nine lakhs) paid by the appellant herein to the mother of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent was received, the balance amounts were syphoned off by A-1 & A-2 by opening an account in a Cooperative Society in the name of the 2<sup>nd</sup>

respondent without his authorization. The larger conspiracy can be found out only after investigation as has been stated in the earlier reports filed.

**8.** Shri Siddharth Agarwal, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant however points out that the recitals in the agreement clearly indicates the entire consideration having been paid which is also by way of demand draft, which cannot be now resiled from. The demand draft was dated 30.01.2020 and was encashed on 31.01.2020, the very next day. A rectification deed was signed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent on 16.03.2020 after about one and a half months. In view of the categorical statement made in the present report filed by the Deputy Commissioner of Police, there is no cause to further continue the proceedings, is the compelling contention.

**9.** We are also of the opinion that in view of the specific admission of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, the complainant, the vendor in the sale agreement and

who also executed rectification deed that he had put the signatures therein; the earlier reports filed by the police are of little consequence. As of now, the signatures have been admitted contrary to the allegation of forgery and fabrication. The recitals in the deed clearly indicate the consideration, having been received, part of which is admitted as having been received by the mother of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and the balance by way of demand draft, which also stood encashed. The fact that a rectification deed was executed by the applicant much later to the encashment of the demand draft, further puts the matter free of any doubt regarding the specific transaction.

**10.** We find absolutely no reason to sustain the impugned order and set aside the same and quash the proceedings qua the appellant herein; against whom on this subject matter there shall be no further proceeding. We make it clear that we have not made any observation regarding the other transactions and

the prosecution or the defense with respect to the other matters would have to be proceeded with on its own merits based on the contentions of the parties and the evidence led before the jurisdictional court.

**11.** With the above reservation, the present appeal is allowed.

**12.** Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

..... J.  
**(AHSANUDDIN  
AMANULLAH)**

..... J.  
**(K. VINOD CHANDRAN)**

**NEW DELHI  
DECEMBER 16, 2025.**