

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

101

Crl. Misc. No.M-5989 of 2019

Date of Decision:- 08.02.2019

Inderjeet Singh

...Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present:- Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral),

The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.146 dated 10.05.2018 registered at Police Station Division No.5, District Ludhiana under Sections 177, 199, 200, 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC.

The aforementioned FIR came to be registered on a complaint made by Sh. Anoop Singh, Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Ludhiana. According to the complaint, a person stood surety for the accused and furnished forged property documents apart from impersonating the owner of the property.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. He is the Clerk of an Advocate and had only filled up the bail bonds and security papers. He has been implicated in this case on the disclosure statement of the co-accused, who actually stood surety and committed impersonation. Thus, the petitioner may be granted anticipatory bail.

According to the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused, the petitioner was instrumental in getting him to stand surety by impersonating someone else. Thus, the petitioner is the main accused and is responsible for producing forged property papers as well as making someone impersonate the true owner of the property. Thus, the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner

cannot be accepted.

The petition is without any merit and is accordingly dismissed.

February 08, 2019
poonam

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
1. The defendant's conduct was negligent	Yes
2. The defendant's conduct was reckless	Yes
3. The defendant's conduct was intentional	Yes
4. The defendant's conduct was a crime	Yes
5. The defendant's conduct was a tort	Yes
6. The defendant's conduct was a breach of contract	Yes
7. The defendant's conduct was a breach of duty	Yes
8. The defendant's conduct was a breach of trust	Yes
9. The defendant's conduct was a breach of confidence	Yes
10. The defendant's conduct was a breach of property	Yes
11. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public order	Yes
12. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public safety	Yes
13. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public health	Yes
14. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public morals	Yes
15. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public decency	Yes
16. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public order	Yes
17. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public safety	Yes
18. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public health	Yes
19. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public morals	Yes
20. The defendant's conduct was a breach of public decency	Yes

Whether reportable	No
---------------------------	-----------