

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

**CRM No.M-34422 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: November 10, 2016**

Surinder Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Balbir Singh Jaswal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms.Bhavna Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.N.P.S.Mann, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.219 dated 6.06.2016 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Amritsar.

Notice of motion was issued and learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 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 has been registered on the basis

of written complaint against Balbir Kaur, Surinder Singh, Rupinder Kaur and Manjit Singh. As per the allegations, 38 kanals 8 marlas land has been sold to the complainants @ ₹15 lakhs per acre and ₹72 lakhs was taken and sale deed was executed on 13.01.2014. It is the case of the complainants that there was bank loan of ₹18 lakhs on the land in question which has not been paid by the accused as agreed. Balbir Kaur, mother of the present petitioner was the owner and Surinder Singh petitioner has signed the sale deed as attesting witness. It is also argued by learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 that on 08.09.2015, again a sale deed has been executed regarding the same land for about ₹50 lakhs in favour of Gurjeet Kaur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that as the total amount has not been paid by the complainants i.e. vendee of the first sale deed, therefore, the property was sold again.

Keeping in view the 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, 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.

November 10, 2016
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No