

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-12061 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 07.04.2016

Mohinder Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. P.S. Jammu, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C seeking the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.349 dated 2.9.2014 under sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 I.P.C, registered at Police Station, Rania, District Sirsa.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length and the pleadings on record have been perused.

Precise allegations against the present petitioner are that while serving as the concerned revenue official i.e. Halqa Patwari, a false mutation of inheritance bearing no.6938 dated 28.6.2010 was sanctioned in favour of co-accused namely Sarita, Bhim Sen, Raj Kumar, Vinod, Vidya Devi, Rani Devi and Raj Bala showing all of them to be legal heirs of Gokal Chand pertaining to 42 kanals and 5 marlas of land. Based on such false mutation the afore-noticed accused sold the land in question to the complainant namely Surjit Singh for a sale consideration of Rs.26,41,000/- and even the sale deed was executed on 9.7.2010.

Subsequently complainant became aware that the afore-noticed co-accused were neither owners of the land nor the legal heirs of Gokal Chand and all of them have connived with the concerned revenue officials

thereby causing loss to the complainant.

Allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. Prima facie, there is a gross abuse of powers at the hands of the concerned revenue official i.e. the present petitioner.

In the light of such allegations and gravity of offence, this Court is not inclined to extend to the petitioner concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition, accordingly, is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

07.04.2016
lucky