

205

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

**CRM-M-3760 of 2015 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: February 16, 2015**

Vinod Bhati

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA**

**Present:** Mr. Amit Parashar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Doon, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Ram Bilas Gupta, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**SABINA, J**

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.226 dated 11.06.2013, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sarai Khawaja, District Faridabad.

Prosecution story in brief is that the petitioner and his co-accused had sold the land of the complainant by preparing forged documents. The purchasers had raised constructions over the land of the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case. In fact, complainant had executed agreement to sell qua the property in question in favour of the petitioner and in this regard, reliance has been placed on Annexure P-2.

Learned State counsel, who is assisted by counsel for the complainant, on the other hand has opposed the petition and has submitted that in fact, the agreement to sell (Annexure P-2) was executed between the parties in view of the compromise effected between the parties much after the registration of the FIR. However, petitioner had only paid ₹10,00,000/- to the complainant and sale-deed was to be executed on or before 01.02.2015 after the payment of ₹1,40,00,000/-. However, sale-deed has not been executed between the parties, as the petitioner has failed to honour the compromise. Learned State counsel has further submitted that petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Thus, in the present case, allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the prosecution case, petitioner and his co-accused had sold the land belonging to the complainant and the purchasers had raised construction over the said land. It appears that after the registration of the FIR, parties tried to amicably settled their dispute. However, petitioner has failed to honour the compromise. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Hence, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)  
JUDGE**

**February 16, 2015**  
*m.singh*