

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

**CRM No.M-23894 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: August 02, 2017**

Kewal Krishan

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.G.B.S.Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Sr. DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Deepak Sabharwal, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.53 dated 02.03.2016 under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Phagwara City, District Kapurthala.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant 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.

As per the prosecution version, Satnam Singh and Jasvir Singh

were owners of some land. Satnam Singh was also the General Power of

Attorney of his brother Lakhvir Singh. He executed an agreement to sell in favour of Anil Kumar. They also appointed Kewal Krishan as General Power Attorney. Said Anil Kumar was also authorized to sell the land to any other person. So, under that authority, Anil Kumar executed an agreement to sell in favour of complainant along with Chandar Shekhar. The suit land was found acquired by the improvement trust, Phagwara. The trust deposited the compensation amount for payment to the owners. When the complainant applied to the Court for payment, in the meantime, accused persons, with dishonest intention, cancelled the General Power of Attorney given to Kewal Krishan and appointed Special Attorney Rajat Dhillon to receive the payment etc. It is also stated that by cancelling the power of attorney and giving special attorney etc., they all have connived and cheated the complainant.

Learned counsel for the complainant also argued that all this has been done by the accused in connivance with each other to cheat the complainant.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, nature and gravity of the offence, without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

August 02, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No