

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

CRL. MISC. No.M-21659 OF 2015 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 28th July, 2015

Bagga Singh @ Dilbag Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

* * * *

Present : Mr. Dhirender Chopra, Advocate for
Mr. Gurinder Singh Hayer, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P. S. Ghuman, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

* * * *

SURINDER GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.58 dated 29.05.2015 registered at Police Station Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib for offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 read with Sections 120-B IPC.

Heard.

As per the case of the prosecution, the FIR in this case was registered on the complaint of Puran Singh son of Kawar Singh, whose land measuring two and half marla was sold through an imposter to Karamjit Kaur vide sale deed No.2736 dated 23.09.2014. Puran Singh on coming to know of this fraud, appeared before the registration authority levelling allegations against the purchaser, the person who impersonated

him and the witnesses of the sale deed. The matter was enquired and during investigation it transpired that it is the petitioner who was the king pin in the conspiracy and it was at his instance that Bhola Singh had impersonated as Puran Singh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is neither named by the complainant nor he is beneficiary. It was due to the political rivalry that he has been falsely involved in this case.

Learned State counsel argued that on the complaint of Puran Singh the matter was thoroughly inquired by the police which revealed that it was the petitioner who entered into deal with Karamjit Kaur for purchase of land of Puran Singh. He prepared the false identity documents for Bhola Singh who appeared and impersonated as Puran Singh and also managed the attesting witnesses. When the matter came to light, the sale consideration to Karamjit Kaur was also returned by the petitioner and she, as a witness, has got recorded her statement to this effect.

On perusal of the FIR, the allegation against the petitioner and keeping in view the serious nature of the offence that an attempt was made to sell the property of a person by producing some impersonator before the registration authority, I am of the considered opinion that this matter requires in depth investigation, for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. This petition has no merits.

Dismissed.

28th July, 2015
'raj'

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE