

**101+203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-608 of 2016 (O&M)**  
**DATE OF DECISION: 12.7.2016**

**MAHENDER KUMAR BHATIA** .. Petitioner

**VS.**

STATE OF HARYANA .... Respondent.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI**

Present: Mr. Arvind Kashyap, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanu Shree, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**A.B. CHAUDHARI, J.**

**CRM-20023-2016**

CM is allowed.

Reply of the complainant/applicant is taken on record.

## MAIN CASE

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

This Court has already passed an order dated 12.1.2016 granting interim bail to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposed the application for anticipatory bail on the ground that there is a forgery of the signature of the witness on the partition document that may be a mutual partition document and therefore the offence is serious. I have perused the document of mutual partition. It is undisputed that the complainant as well as the applicant are closely related. There was a mutual partition. The allegation is that the signature of the witness was forged when a witness in fact had already expired. In my opinion, the nature of dispute prima facie being a

civil in nature. The interim order made by this Court should be confirmed.

The interim order dated 12.1.2016 passed by this Court is made absolute.

**(A. B. CHAUDHARI)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 12, 2016**  
SwarnjitS