

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

**CRM-M No.31001 of 2018  
Decided on: 07.09.2018**

Dal Chand

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

**Present :** Dr. Deipa Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vinod K. Kanwal, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J.**

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short 'Cr.P.C.') in FIR No.505 dated 13.06.2017, for offence punishable under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station City Ballabhgarh, District Faridabad.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the allegation in the FIR, a plot measuring 02 kanals 03 marlas, owned by Tejpal, the uncle of the petitioner, was sold on 22.06.2016 and thereafter, the mutation was also sanctioned on the basis of the same. It is further submitted that the petitioner was an attesting witness to the said sale deed along with one Vinay Rawat and co-accused Pammi @

Parmod Basoya and Pawan sons of Baljit Singh, who are the mediators of the deed and the property was purchased by one Ravina. Counsel for the petitioner has, thus, argued that the petitioner was not the beneficiary of the sale deed and his role was only of an attesting witness.

Counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Ravinder, assisted by counsel for the complainant has, however, submitted that after the complaint was lodged with the police, a detailed enquiry was conducted and in the enquiry, it was revealed that, in fact, the petitioner actively participated in the fake sale of the property of his uncle – Tejpal and they have misrepresented the complainant – Ravina that the property of Tejpal can be sold and it was sold for a total sale consideration of Rs.1 crore 55 lacs, by putting an imposter in place of Tejpal, though, the sale deed was executed on collector's rate for Rs.24,84,500/-. It is further submitted that the co-accused – Pammi @ Parmod Basoya had taken a sum of Rs.32 lacs from the husband of the complainant whereas the petitioner – Dal Chand has taken a sum of Rs.1 crore 10 lacs from the husband of the complainant and later on, it came to the notice of the complainant that by preparing forged affidavit and documents of Tejpal and his brothers, the sale deed has been executed in a fraudulent manner and, therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required with regard to the recovery of documents, which have been forged.

After hearing the counsel for the parties, I find no ground to grant the relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Considering the serious allegations levelled against the petitioner with regard to the

forgery committed by him and other accused persons, for executing the sale deed of the property of his uncle Tejpal and alluring the complainant to part away with huge amount, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)  
JUDGE

07.09.2018

yakub

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable:       | Yes/No |