

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

CRM-M No.5082 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of decision: 28.11.2019

Raj Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sunil Saharan, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 6.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondents No.2 to 6 in FIR No.691 dated 18.11.2018 registered under Sections 181, 194, 196, 199, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar, District Hisar.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that the FIR was registered with the allegations that subsequent to acquisition of the land in the village, one land acquisition case was filed by Jitender and others being owners of the land. The said Jitender expired on 12.06.2007 and his widow had performed marriage with one Parveen. In the execution proceedings, the mother of Jitender namely Bhawani Devi had made a wrong statement that she is the only legal representative and have received the compensation amount. On the plea that a wrong application has been made, the present FIR was registered in which the Additional Sessions Judge has granted the concession of anticipatory

bail to Bhawani Devi and her other sons.

Counsel for the petitioner has further argued that the petitioner is the co-villager and has got the aforesaid FIR registered as a wrong application was made on behalf of Bhawani Devi. Though, Jitender was having a son out of his wedlock with Smt. Meena and has even filed a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act for dissolution of the marriage and therefore, the anticipatory bail granted to respondents No.2 to 6 may be canceled.

In reply, counsel for the State as well as counsel for respondents No.2 to 6 have argued that, in fact, the dispute between the petitioner and Meena has already been settled and the amount has been paid to her and she is residing in the family of respondents No.2 to 6. The counsel has raised an objection about the *locus standi* of the petitioner to register an FIR as he is not an aggrieved person.

Since the present petition praying for cancellation of anticipatory bail is not based upon the grounds on which the same can be canceled i.e. misusing the concession of anticipatory bail, extending any threat to the witnesses or absconding from the process of the Court, I find no ground to entertain this petition.

Dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

28.11.2019
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No