

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

**CRM No.M-31977 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: August 02, 2017**

Dr.Om Parkash Sharma

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Gautam Dutt, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Brijesh Sharma, Asstt. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Deepender Singh, 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.380 dated 22.06.2016 under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 471, 506, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Central Faridabad, District Faridabad.

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.

From the record, I find that FIR in the present case has been got

registered by complainant Surender Singh Bedi against the present petitioner by filing a complaint under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. As per the allegations in the FIR, more than ₹3 crores was given to the petitioner and he cheated the complainant and played fraud with the complainant.

At the time of arguments, learned counsel for the complainant showed some documents to this Court, especially, the agreement to sell, copy of which is Annexure P-3 at page No.34. This document has not been signed by the complainant but only by the petitioner and other all pages were attested by the Notary Public but this page was not attested by Notary Public. Learned counsel for the complainant further argued that the petitioner has forged some documents and has misused the same in these proceedings also. Similarly, learned counsel for the complainant stated that in Annexure P-4 agreement to sell, the hand-written words at page No.2 of this document have been added later on and this document has also been forged. He next argued that keeping in view the facts that so many documents have been forged, present petitioner is not entitled for any relief. The amount has been paid to the petitioner, which is a huge amount of more than ₹3 crores, which is admitted by the petitioner but by forging the documents, he has shown the liability upon the complainant.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner denied all these allegations and stated that the petitioner has not forged any document and he is innocent and has not committed any offence.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find that the petitioner is

benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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