

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

**CRM-M-21071-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.5.2018**

Tarlok Singh

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Muthreja, DAG, Haryana.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.(Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.3 dated 7.4.2018 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 427, 120-B Indian Penal Code at Police Station NRI City, District Jalandhar.

Heard.

Briefly stated, FIR has been registered against the petitioner along with Kuldeep Kaur, Bishan Singh and Jaimal Singh on the allegations that they prepared false will and death certificate of Karam Singh and then got sanctioned mutation in her favour with regard to one house bearing No.137/11 situated at Central Town, Jalandhar owned by Karam Singh. The further allegation in the FIR is that the date of death of Karam Singh was

wrongly mentioned as 6.8.2009 in the death certificate whereas he actually died on 16.8.2011 in Nairobi. On the basis of a forged will, the mutation was got sanctioned in favour of Kuldip Kaur who disposed of the property further in favour of Mohinder Singh.

Serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner that while acting as a care taker of the property, he has instituted a civil suit and then withdrew it in connivance with the remaining accused. On the dismissal of the suit, mutation was got sanctioned on the basis of alleged will.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record photostat copy of passport of Paramjeet Kaur Bhogal and the alleged affidavit sworn by her at Nairobi before an Advocate Commissioner for Oaths & Notary Public but this affidavit has not been authenticated and cannot be looked into at this stage.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances mentioned above, the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

May 30, 2018
Paritosh Kumar

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No