

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

Date of Decision:-07.01.2016

CRM-M No.20360 of 2015(O&M)

Sukhwinder Kaur & Anr.

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

2

CRM-M No.23377 of 2015

Simranjeet Singh @ Appu.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

3

CRM-M No.28838 of 2015

Amandeep Singh.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ranjan Lakhanpal, Advocate for the Petitioner
(in **CRM-M No.20360 of 2015**).

Mr. Avtar Singh Bhatti, Advocate for the Petitioner
(in **CRM-M No.23377 of 2015**).

Mr. Angel Sharma, Advocate for the Petitioner
(in **CRM-M No.28838 of 2015**).

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
assisted by ASI Palwinder Singh.

Mr. Namit Gautam, Advocate for complainant.

JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL)

This order shall dispose of the aforesaid three petitions wherein prayer is under Section 438 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, namely, Sukhwinder Kaur and Inderbir Singh (in **CRM-M No.20360 of 2015**), Simranjeet Singh @ Appu (in **CRM-M No.23377 of 2015**) and Amandeep Singh (in **CRM-M No.28838 of 2015**) in case FIR No.35 dated 28.04.2015 for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Haibowal, District Ludhiana.

The allegations levelled by the complainant Hemant Sood are that he had purchased Plot No.D-212 at village South City Barewal Road, Ludhiana from the owner Jaswinder Singh. After the sale deed it was found that the sale deed had been got executed through an impersonator by the wife Sukhwinder Kaur and son Inderbir of the real owner Jaswinder Singh. The impersonator was further identified by the two co-accused Simranjeet Singh @ Appu and Amandeep Singh.

It was contended that if at all it is the real Jaswinder Singh who was the aggrieved party, however, he has owned the sale deed. All the petitioners were granted interim bail.

Subsequently all the petitioners-accused and the complainant party have drawn up a compromise deed dated 14.09.2015 whereby it has been agreed that the entire sale consideration would be refunded back to the complainant party.

By way of **CRM No.32723 of 2015** in **CRM-M No.20360 of 2015** said compromise deed has been placed on record.

At the time of hearing learned Counsel for complainant submits that part payment of the amount to be refunded has already been received and the remaining is to be disbursed during the month of January. He further states that in view of the terms of compromise, he has no objection if the anticipatory bail granted to all the petitioners named above is ordered to be confirmed.

Learned State Counsel on instructions from ASI Palwinder Singh in the light of compromise of a private dispute has possibly no objection for making interim protection absolute.

In view of the above, interim protection/pre-arrest bail granted vide orders dated 09th of July, 2015 to petitioners Sukhwinder Kaur and Inderbir Singh (in **CRM-M No.20360 of 2015**), dated 30th July, 2015 to petitioner Simranjeet Singh @ Appu (in **CRM-M No.23377 of 2015**) and dated 27th August 2015 to petitioner Amandeep Singh (in **CRM-M No.28838 of 2015**) is made absolute.

It is clarified that the parties will be bound by their respective stands and in case there is any violation, the other party would be free to seek recalling of the aforesaid order.

Petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

January 07, 2016
Vinay