

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

(1) Criminal Misc. No.M-26144 of 2017

.....

Date of decision:2.8.2018

Virpal Kaur and another

.....Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

....

(2) Criminal Misc. No.M-47911 of 2017

.....

Hargopal and another

.....Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

....

(3) Criminal Misc. No.M-48558 of 2017

.....

Hari Bhagwan

.....Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

....

Present: Mr. Parvinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioners in Cr. Misc.
Nos.M-26144 and 48558 of 2017.

Mr. Gursimran Singh, Advocate for the petitioners in Cr. Misc.
No.M-47911 of 2017.

Mr. H.S. Grewal, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

This order will dispose of the above mentioned three petitions filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0007 dated 13.6.2017 (wrongly mentioned as 12.06.2017 in the order dated 05.07.2017) registered for the offences under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC and (Section 406 IPC, which was added later on) at Police Station N.R.I., District Hoshiarpur.

Notice of motion has been issued in these cases.

Mr. H.S. Grewal, learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and contested these petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State and have gone through the record.

As per the FIR, the complainant purchased land measuring 747 Kanals 15 Marlas for ₹3,40,15,000/- from Narinder Kumar and Veepal Kaur. Later on, the complainant received summons from the Civil Court in Civil Suit titled Satnam Singh v. Narinder Singh etc., in which the vendors of the complainant had been shown to have entered into agreement to sell. That suit was decreed. In the appeal, the parties had effected compromise and the appeal was allowed on the basis of compromise. The suit of Satnam Singh had been dismissed and the decree was set aside.

The petitioners have already joined the investigation. The petitioners are not required for custodial interrogation. No useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioners to custody.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the cases, I find merit in these petitions and the same are allowed. The interim orders dated 25.7.2017, 15.12.2017 and 19.12.2017 respectively passed in the above mentioned petitions by this Court granting interim bail to the petitioners are made absolute. However, the petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions of Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

August 2, 2018.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No