

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

CRM-M-11418 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 09.05.2017

Madan Lal Aggarwal @ Madan Chaudhary and another

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Manish Mehta, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition, under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No. 294 dated 04.10.2016, registered under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Nangal Chaudhary, District Mahendergarh.

It is contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. No cheating or forgery has been committed by the petitioners. The dispute is purely of civil nature. Nothing is to be recovered from the petitioners.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application and states that petitioners in connivance with each other by forging the power of attorney had sold the land of respondent No.2. In

fact, respondent No.2 never gave power of attorney to petitioner No.1.

Heard.

As per FIR, the petitioners in connivance with each other impersonated the complainant/respondent No.2 and prepared a bogus power of attorney qua the land of respondent No.2 and sold the same to other persons. Keeping in view the nature of offence, this Court feels that it is a fit case where custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required to know their modus operandi. Accordingly, no case for pre-arrest bail is made out at this stage.

Dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

09.05.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No