



2026 INSC 530

Corrected

Non-Reportable

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

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.2457 OF 2026

Sunisha Anand

...Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana & Anr.

...Respondents

ORDER

The above appeal is filed by one of the applicants before the High Court seeking interference to FIR No.588 dated 02.06.2018, registered at the Police Station, Faridabad Central. The impugned common order in two petitions declined relief holding that though the dispute primarily pertains to land and a civil suit has already been filed there are criminal elements, which cannot be ignored since the accused persons are alleged to have knowingly prepared and executed forged General Power of Attorneys (GPAs), despite being aware that a portion of the land in question have been transferred to the State of Uttar Pradesh.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
Deepak Guptani
Date: 2026.05.23
11:14:25 IST
Reason: 

2. Sri Siddharth Luthra, learned Senior Counsel pointed out that in the First FIR though the name of the appellant herein is mentioned she was not arrayed as an accused. By a supplementary FIR, the appellant has been arrayed, though there is no material seen to have been unearthed on the further investigation after the first FIR. The decision in ***Mariam Fasihuddin & Anr. v. State by Aduogodi Police Station & Anr.***¹ is relied on, wherein submission of supplementary report in the absence of new evidence was frowned upon.

3. Sri Abhinav Bajaj, learned Additional Attorney General for the respondent-State argues that there is no reason to quash the FIR and the appellant has been arrayed subsequently by reason of the details revealed on investigation. The first FIR was registered and in the course of the investigation, the appellant's role was also disclosed and hence she was arrayed as an accused.

4. The allegation as seen from the first FIR is that the appellant is the daughter of one Onkar Singh and Mohinder Kaur, who are title holders to certain properties. Onkar Singh having died, the appellant also obtained right over the said property by way of succession. It is the allegation that the mother of the appellant got

¹ (2024) 11 SCC 733

fake GPAs executed and registered on the strength of which lands were transferred to the accused Pratap Singh and Prem Pal, who entered into further conveyances with respect to the same properties. It was also alleged that the appellant and her mother did not have title over the entire properties, the title to a portion of which having been divested by transfer to the Government. In the first FIR, the first information statement refers to the appellant, but the appellant was not made one of the accused. In the second FIR produced as Annexure P10 the very same allegations are levelled and there is nothing unearthed to find the culpability of the appellant herein but for a reference to a *jamabandi* having been referred to in the document, which in fact does not exist.

5. As we see from the records, the de-facto complainant, the second respondent is said to be in possession of certain lands, which was the subject matter of the transaction alleged. The mother of the appellant is said to have executed a GPA on the strength of which and by a separate sale deed having conveyed certain properties to the accused. We are unable to comprehend how the GPA can be termed as fake or fraudulent, when the very contention is that the GPAs were executed by the mother and daughter. Further the *jamabandi* having been noticed in the sale

deed or the vendors having conveyed more property than they had title over cannot lead to any criminal liability as such; which if at all alleged, should be by the purchasers. Here, a person alleged to be in occupation of a land has filed the complaint and we are unable to find any reason on facts as disclosed from the FIR to even allege any criminality on the appellant herein. Admittedly, there is a civil suit pending as initiated by the de-facto complainant. Criminal law cannot be used to further the cause in a purely civil dispute.

6. We, hence, quash FIR No.588 dated 02.06.2018, Annexure P10, registered at Faridabad Central Police Station and all consequential proceedings insofar, the appellant herein is concerned.

7. The above appeal is allowed.

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

..... J.
(SANJAY KUMAR)

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

NEW DELHI;
May 11, 2026.