

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

**CRM No.M-17793 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision:23.05.2016**

Tarlok Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

Petitioner seeks concession of pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.14 dated 24.01.2016, under Sections 420/467/468/471/120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Zira, District Ferozepur.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

Briefly, it may be noticed that FIR in question came to be registered on the complaint of Parminder Singh, Balwant Singh, Hardayal Singh and Rachhpal Singh. Complainants had asserted that on 25.08.2015, a deal was struck regarding 76 kanals of land with the accused party. Complainants were given to understand that the land in question was under the ownership of Avtar Singh son of Chanan Singh and Satnam Singh, Harpreet Singh sons of Joginder Singh. The deal was stated to have been finalized at the rate of Rs.15.25 lacs per acre and the target date for execution of the sale deed was fixed for 20.10.2015. Complainants asserted that over a period of time a total sum of Rs.1 crore had been made over as earnest money to the seller party. On 20.10.2015, complainants state that they presented themselves before the office of competent Sub Registrar for getting the sale deed executed but the seller party did not come present.

Precise accusation against the present petitioner is that he was

one of the brokers who had facilitated the deal and he had in connivance with one Surmukh Singh @ Sukhmander Singh prepared forged revenue documents as also fake documents pertaining to the real owners i.e. Avtar Singh etc. Even the agreement to sell is stated to have not been signed by the real owners.

Even though, it has been argued that the present petitioner was only a property dealer and was not a beneficiary of the transaction, yet the allegations against the petitioner are direct and specific. Allegations are serious in nature and the matter would require a deep and thorough probe for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner may well be warranted.

Petition is dismissed.

23.05.2016

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**