

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

(i) CRM No.M-2777 of 2017 (O&M)

Surinder Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(ii) CRM No.M-5437 of 2017 (O&M)

Tarlochan Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(iii) CRM No.M-6173 of 2017 (O&M)

Manmohan Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Date of Decision: August 08, 2017

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.G.S.Verma, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CRM No.M-2777 and 6173 of 2017).

Mr.Sharwan Sehgal, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-5437 of 2017).

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

Mr.Mandeep Kaushik, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

All the above-mentioned cases are taken up together as the same have arisen from same FIR.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.135 dated 24.12.2016 under Sections 420, 120-B, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC, registered at Police Station Division No.3, Ludhiana.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petitions.

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 as per the allegations in the FIR, Tarlochan Singh prepared agreement to sell in his favour and other petitioners Manmohan Singh and Surinder Singh were the attesting witnesses. As per the FIR, Tarlochan Singh propounded an agreement to sell dated 14.05.2015 allegedly executed by Ram Lal, Raj Kumar, Pawan, Laddi, Manohar Lal, Chaman Lal, Rakesh, Nisha, Satpal and Paramjit Kaur in connivance with Manmohan Singh and Surinder Singh. The statements of all these persons have been recorded, who have stated that they have not executed any agreement. Even signatures of two persons were sent to FSL and according to FSL report, the signatures are different and not signed by those persons.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present

case, I find that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required. Further, in view of the serious allegations and active participation of these accused and also in view of the fact that forged agreement has been executed to usurp the property of Ram Lal etc., I do not find it a fit case, where petitioners are entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in all the petitions, the same are dismissed.

August 08, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No