

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

CRM-M No.3161 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : 23.08.2016

Satinderbir Singh @ Jatinderbir Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. V.K.Jindal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Amardeep Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Amarjit Kaur Khurana, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Ms. Deepa Kalra, respondent No.2 in person.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This is a petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the
petitioner under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.20, dated
25.09.2015 registered under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/471/120-B
IPC at Police Station, NRI, District Ludhiana.

The allegation is that the petitioner got the property of his brother transferred in his own name by impersonation.

On 10.03.2016 the following order was passed :-

“On the oral request made by learned senior counsel for the petitioner, Ms. Deepa Kalra wife of Sh. Manmohan Singh Kalra, Resident of H.No.75, Gandhi Colony, Ludhiana is impleaded as party respondent No.2.

Registry is directed to carry out the necessary changes in the memo of parties.

Complainant is the wife of brother of the present petitioner. Allegations in a nutshell are with regard to the present petitioner having transferred the 50% share of brother of the petitioner, namely, Manmohan Singh Kalra in respect of a plot measuring 480 sq.yds. by way of impersonation.

Learned senior counsel, at the very outset, makes a categorical statement that the petitioner is ready and willing to compensate the complainant/his brother Manmohan Singh Kalra by way of transfer of another plot measuring 220 sq. yds. in the same locality and in addition thereto some monetary compensation also. On such basis, interim protection for a period of two weeks is sought.

Notice of motion, returnable for 30.03.2016.

Dasti process as well.

Arrest of the petitioner is stayed till the next date of hearing.”

Respondent No.2 is present in Court and states that the offer made by the petitioner on 10.03.2016 is extremely misleading since the value of the plot of her husband was much more than the plot being sought to be transferred. As per her even the half share purchased by the petitioner in his name was a fraud because the money had been given by her husband to buy plot in his name but the petitioner first misappropriated half that money by getting 50% property transferred in his name and then later on got the entire property transferred in his name.

In the totality of circumstances, I do not consider it to be a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending criminal miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

23.08.2016

Pooja sharma-I

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No