

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-1 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.01.2016

Balwinder Singh Patwari

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. S.C. Sabharwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Ms. Sunita Punia, Advocate for complainant.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

This order shall dispose of CRM No. M-1 of 2016 (Balwinder Singh Patwari Vs. State of Punjab) and CRM No. M-2 of 2016 (Atma Singh Vs. State of Punjab) as both these petitions have been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C seeking the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners herein in case F.I.R. No.175 dated 28.11.2015 under sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B I.P.C, registered at Police Station, Makhu, District Ferozepur.

The petitioners herein are revenue officials. Balwinder Singh, petitioner in CRM No. M-1 of 2016 is a serving Patwari Halqa and Atma Singh, petitioner in CRM No. M-2 of 2016 is a retired Naib Tehsildar.

Suffice it to notice that the allegations against both the petitioners are with regard to a report having been submitted in respect of 15 kanals of land belonging to the Central Govt. and such report having been submitted by Balwinder Singh Patwari without even checking the *Roznamcha* as regards possession and change of revenue entries in favour of one Jarnail Singh and Chhinder Singh and which has resulted in allotment

of such land in their favour. Such report was affirmed by Atma Singh again without due verification.

The contention raised by counsel that it was Devinder Singh Patwari, who had changed the *Girdawari* way back in the year 1997 and the present petitioners are not at fault, does not inspire any confidence. The concerned report be it with regard to possession relating to the land in question had to be furnished upon exercising due diligence at the hands of the revenue officials.

In the light of such serious allegations, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners.

Both the petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

08.01.2016
lucky