

210

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

CRM-M No.15205 of 2018
Date of Decision: 25.04.2018

Sonu Sibia

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Yogesh Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hittan Nehra, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

1. Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.217 dated 13.10.2014, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, District Ludhiana City.

2. First anticipatory bail i.e. CRM-M No.36865 of 2014 was dismissed on 24.02.2015. Second anticipatory bail i.e. CRM-M No.8610 of 2015 was dismissed as withdrawn on 28.05.2015. Thereafter, petitioner surrendered himself on 18.01.2018.

3. Allegations against the petitioner are that in respect of plot owned by Satyapal Nahar, a forged sale deed was

prepared by one Raj Virk and thereafter, the same was sold. During inquiry, it came out that Rajinder Singh @ Raja Kheri had approached the Halqa Patwari for getting the mutation sanctioned by producing forged affidavit of aforesaid Satyapal Nahar. In the said process, Rajinder Singh @ Raja Kheri had obtained help of the petitioner in the effort of getting the mutation sanctioned in the name of Satyapal Nahar by producing some imposter.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that Rajinder Singh @ Raja Kheri has already been granted anticipatory bail by the court of Sessions on 15.12.2014. Co-accused Raj Virk has been granted regular bail by the High Court in CRM-M No.4114 of 2015 on 13.02.2015.

5. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Karamjit Singh submits that the petitioner is in custody since 18.01.2018 and challan has been presented.

6. Offence is triable by Magistrate.

7. Petitioner is in custody since 18.01.2018 and he is no more required in further investigation of the case.

8. Looking to the facts and circumstances of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail.

9. In view of above, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail, subject to his furnishing

adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

10. Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

25.04.2018
jyoti

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No