

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

CRM-M-39566-2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-16.11.2018

Satyawati

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Jangvir Singh Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Choudhary, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

* * * * *

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

The petitioner Satyawati seeks grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against her vide FIR No.837 dated 21.9.2016 registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City Ballabgarh, District Faridabad.

The allegations, in nutshell, against the petitioner, who is a lady aged 65 years, are that she had executed a sale-deed in favour of one Bimlesh, although earlier the said property had been agreed to be sold to complainant Kailash Devi.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and also the learned State counsel.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, I find that the petitioner had entered into transaction for sale of plot measuring 22 Sq.Yds. to one Premchand and had received the entire sale consideration. However, the sale-deed had not been executed and it had been agreed that the petitioner would execute sale-deed in the name of any such person in

whose name Premchand wishes to get the sale-deed executed. Premchand further sold the property to one Krishan Gupta and the said Krishan Gupta sold the property to Kailash Devi. Subsequently, on the asking of Premchand, as per the original agreement, the petitioner executed a sale-deed in favour of Bimlesh.

Since nothing has been shown at this stage as to whether, the petitioner had conspired or was in connivance with Premchand in any manner or that she had herself entered into agreement with complainant Bimlesh and had received sale consideration from Bimlesh as well, in my opinion, keeping in view the said facts and also the age of the petitioner, it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition, as such, is accepted and the interim directions issued by this Court vide order dated 11.9.2018 are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when directed.

It is, however, made clear that in case the petitioner does not cooperate with the investigation, it will be open to the prosecution to move for cancellation of bail.

The present petition stands accepted accordingly.

16.11.2018

pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No