

7# \$~

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2014/2018**

BALESHWER SINGH

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Ms. Saraswati Bhardwaj,
Advocate.

versus

STATE (NCT OF GOVT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Represented by: Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP for State
with Inspector Subhash Kumar,
PS Sonia Vihar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

24.09.2018

%

1. By this petition, petitioner seeks bail in case FIR No.374/2016 under Sections 467/468/420/471/120B IPC registered at PS Sonia Vihar, Delhi on the complaint of Rohit Bhati.
 2. A status report has been handed over which is taken on record.
 3. In the above noted FIR Rohit Bhati alleged that he has purchased a plot admeasuring 50 sq. yards in January, 2015 from one Niranjan Singh s/o Ishwar Singh as Niranjan Singh represented himself to be the owner of the said plot. The said deal was finalised through Ajab Singh for a sum of ₹10 lakhs which Rohit Bhati paid to Niranjan Singh and handed over the possession of the property. Later when he was constructing the house some other party came at the spot and claimed himself to be the owner of the property.
 4. During the course of investigation it was revealed that by virtue of a
- BAIL APPLN. 2014/2018***

general power of attorney, Kabir and Imran, the original owners of the property, transferred the property to Vinod Kumar, s/o Chottan Singh who further executed a general power of attorney in favour of Vinod s/o Sohan Pal. The petitioner with the help of his wife created a fake chain of documents in the name of Mool Chand, affixed his signatures and sold the property to one Niranjana for a consideration of ₹12 lakhs which was later sold by Niranjana to the complainant by receiving a sum of ₹10 lakhs.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 26th July, 2018 and investigation qua him has completed. Though learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Niranjana Singh has settled the matter with the complainant however, that does not absolve of the petitioner of the alleged offence committed by him. However, considering the fact that the investigation is already complete and trial is likely to take time, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioner. It is, therefore, directed that the petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety bond of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court, further subject to the condition that in case of change of residential address of the petitioner the same will be intimated to the Court concerned by way of an affidavit.

6. Petition is disposed of.

7. Order dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

SEPTEMBER 24, 2018

‘vn’