

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CRM-M-19109-2015

Date of decision: August 24, 2015

Renu Kapoor

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. A.S. Ghangas, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Dhir, DAG, Haryana.

Rajan Gupta, J.

This is a petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail in a case registered against the petitioner under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station City, Panipat, vide FIR No.1103 dated 30.8.2014.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged offences and she has been implicated falsely in the present case. He submits that a perusal of statement of the complainant shows that petitioner is innocent and she has no concern with the alleged offence.

Prayer has been opposed by learned State counsel on the ground that petitioner alongwith co-accused got prepared a forged General Power of Attorney and used the same in getting prepared sale deed No.9282 dated 3.3.2010. Thus, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and given careful thought to the facts of the case.

FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant Darshana Rani wife of Deshraj alleging that accused persons got prepared a forged General Power of Attorney bearing document No.207/4 dated 23.01.2009 and on the basis of same, purchased property from co-accused Praveen Kumar vide sale deed No.9282 dated 3.3.2010. However, on 12.11.2012, complainant came to know that the land of her husband measuring 697.5 sq. yards, as shown in the sale deed No.9282 had been sold by accused Praveen to accused Sushila Devi on the basis of aforesaid General Power of Attorney, whereas husband of the complainant had neither executed any such power of attorney nor disclosed about the aforesaid sale deed. On further enquiry, it was revealed that alleged General Power of Attorney was never entered in the office of Sub Registrar, Mehgaon, District Bhind (Madhya Pradesh) and the same was forged document. It reveals that petitioner has been attributed with a major role in commission of offence by getting prepared forged power of attorney. Allegations against her are serious and he has been specifically named in the FIR.

Keeping in view nature of allegations, petitioner is not entitled to concession of pre-arrest bail. Petition is without any merit and is hereby dismissed.

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

August 24, 2015
'Rajpal'