

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

CRM-M-42374-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 29.11.2016

Mukesh Panchal

..Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. S.K. Tripathi, Advocate for the petitioner.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

This is second petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short 'Cr.P.C.'), for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.15 dated 15.01.2016, registered under Sections 147, 448, 452 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'the IPC') read with Section 149 IPC, at Police Station Sarai Khawaja, Faridabad, District Faridabad, however, later on Sections 147, 448 and 452 IPC read with Section 149 IPC were deleted and Sections 420, 468 and 471 IPC were added.

The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner has no concern with the complainant and the deal entered into between one, Om Parkash and the complainant. He further states that the initial version of the complainant has been found to be false by the Investigating Agency and as such, in the FIR in question which was registered under Sections 147, 448,

452 and 506 IPC read with Section 149 IPC, Sections 147, 448 and 452 IPC read with Section 149 IPC have since been deleted and a new concocted story has been propounded by adding Sections 420, 468 and 471 IPC subsequently.

I have heard the learned counsel and perused the entire record on file.

This is the second bail petition of the petitioner. The earlier one was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 30.08.2016. The allegation against the petitioner is that he, along with other co-accused had entered into the house of the complainant, took illegal possession of the same and had threatened and demanded money from the complainant to vacate the said house. Moreover, at the time of making General Power of Attorney in favour of Om Parkash a condition had been laid down that in future the same would never be cancelled but inspite of this, it had been cancelled with intention to cheat.

In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition stands dismissed.

29.11.2016
ashok

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No

Whether reportable: Yes / No