

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

CRM No.M-29445 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: August 03, 2016

Jatinder Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.V.M.Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Shivali, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Swarn Singh Tiwana and Mr.G.B.S.Dhillon, Advocates
for the complainants.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

CRM No.40926 of 2015

The application is allowed subject to all just exceptions. Kunal Khanna is impleaded as respondent No.2.

CRM No.40927 of 2015 and CRM No.7677 of 2016

The applications are allowed subject to all just exceptions. Annexures A-1 to A-6 and Annexures C-1 to C-6 are taken on record.

CRM No.M-29445 of 2015

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.60 dated 11.06.2015 under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Haibowal Kalan, District Ludhiana.

Notice of motion was issued and learned State counsel as well

as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR in the present case has been got registered on the basis of application moved by Punit Sood. As per the FIR, Dev Parkash Sood was the owner of plots, who died on 17.01.2011. In the year 2007, he bequeathed his entire property which include the above-said plots, in favour of his three grandsons including the complainant, in equal shares. After the death of Dev Parkash Sood, the complainant became the owner. It is also in the complaint that complainant received a registered cover sent by the Advocate, which contained copy of the civil suit titled as 'Jatinder Singh vs. Puneet Sood', from which the complainant came to know that accused-petitioner is claiming ownership over the above-said property on the basis of alleged sale deed dated 19.08.2005 bearing Vasika No.11804 allegedly executed by Dev Parkash Sood during his life time. It is also in the FIR that complainant tried to locate Vasika from the record, but there was no such Vasika. As per record, at Vasika No.11804 dated 19.08.2005, the entry was of one document executed by Mohan Singh in favour of Rajinder Singh. As per the FIR, the present petitioner fabricated the registered sale deed. At the time of arguments, it is also argued that present petitioner has also fabricated the document showing information under the RTI Act by putting forged seals.

Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances of the present case, without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner and fact that petitioner is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled

to benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

August 03, 2016
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

No