

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

**CRM No.M-14777 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.05.2016**

Mohan Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. B.S.Toor, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.16 dated 16.02.2016, under Sections 419/ 420/ 465/ 467/ 468/ 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Haibowal, Ludhiana.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

FIR came to be registered on the statement of Vinod Bassi. Complainant asserted that a sum of Rs.6 lacs was due from the present petitioner since the last three years. Towards settlement of the dues, present petitioner as also one Balihar Singh represented to the complainant that a plot measuring 100 sq. yards was available and they will get the sale deed executed and registered from the original owner and in favour of the complainant. Complainant stated that upon having physically seen the plot, he had agreed and had even parted with an addition sum of Rs.1 lac.

Specific allegations are that the present petitioner had

shown title documents of the plot in question reflecting one Anil Puri to be the owner of the plot. On 16.02.2016, present petitioner is allegedly stated to have telephonically informed the complainant to come present in the office of the Sub Registrar-West, Ludhiana for execution of the sale deed in respect of the plot in question. Further accusation is that at that point of time one Paramjit Singh was presented by the present petitioner to impersonate for the real owner i.e. Anil Puri to facilitate registration of sale deed in favour of the complainant. Upon such impersonator, namely, Paramjit Singh being called upon to furnish his identity proof in token of being the real owner, he is stated to have run away.

The allegations against the present petitioner are direct and specific.

It is a case which would require a thorough and deep probe and for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner may well be warranted.

Under such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to extend in favour of the petitioner the concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition dismissed.

16.05.2016

vandana

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**