

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

CRM-M-3558 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.05.2017

Sukhwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Rajbir Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

None for respondent Nos. 2 to 4.

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. 01 dated 04.01.2017, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Bhikhi, District Mansa.

It is contended that the petitioner in fact is an aggrieved party as he paid Rs.15 lakh to Gurdial Singh, the owner of the land in question. The petitioner is not aware about forgery and impersonation committed by real culprits. In pursuance of order dated 16.03.2017, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application.

Heard.

It has come on record that the land in question was owned by the ancestors of Kartar Singh, Mohna Singh, Kirpal Singh and Gurdial Singh. As per record, three brothers, namely Kartar Singh, Mohna Singh and Kirpal Singh transferred their share in favour of Gurdial Singh who allegedly executed sale deed and the land was sold to co-accused Sukhwinder Singh and Sukhraj Singh. The case of the prosecution is that the said persons left for abroad and thereafter have never visited this country. In fact, the petitioner in connivance with co-accused put up certain imposter(s) to grab the land in question which as per record is under their cultivation since more than 60 years. Even, there is nothing on record whether the LRs of Ralha Singh, the original owner of the land are alive or not. It is the petitioner alone who can explain and reveal the identity of imposters. There is no evidence on record with regard to payment made as the whole amount was stated to be paid in cash. In view of the peculiar facts & circumstances of the case, this Court feels that it is a fit case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to know his modus operandi. Keeping in view the above, 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.

08.05.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes	No
Yes	No