

**CRM-M-21465-2015**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-21465-2015**

**Date of Decision: 14.07.2015**

Jasvir Kaur

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH**

- 1) Whether Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?.
- 2) To be referred to the Reporters or not ?.
- 3) Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. Jatinderpal Singh, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.S.Sidhu, DAG, Punjab.

**Paramjeet Singh, J. (Oral)**

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.85 dated 06.06.2015, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Bathinda, District Bathinda, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has made reference to FIR to contend that the petitioner is not a beneficiary and she has not played any role in the alleged execution of documents. She has not

**CRM-M-21465-2015**

introduced the complainant to co-accused. The original vendors are owners of the property in dispute as per jamabandi for the year 2007-08.

Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner and contended that the petitioner is the main architect of the alleged fraud and cheating, therefore, she does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

I have considered the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties.

The alleged sale deed has been shown to this Court from the file of the investigating officer which transpires that signatures of the petitioner are in existence thereon. The execution and registration of sale deed are two different things. The registration may not have been got done for the reason that correct person was not there. It has also been brought into notice of this Court that the petitioner is also involved in two other cases out of which one is of similar nature as the present case. To blow the lid off fraud allegedly played by the petitioner by cheating, her custodial interrogation is necessary.

In view of above, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

**14.07.2015**  
parveen kumar

**(Paramjeet Singh)**  
**Judge**