

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20716-2019

Date of decision: 23.05.2019

Darshan Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Anter Preet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.S. Barnala, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.21 dated 29.03.2019 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Jodhan, District Ludhiana.

While granting interim bail to the petitioner, following order was passed by this Court on 07.05.2019: -

“.....Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations in the FIR, registered by complainant Gurdeep Singh, it is stated that in the year 1961, house No.52 was allotted to his father Gurbachan Singh and in 1970, another house No.51 was allotted to brother of the complainant Sahib Singh. Thereafter, certain constructions were raised and in the year 1992, father of the complainant had executed an agreement to sell of house No.52 in favour of Nachattar Singh but the deal could not be

materialized and the same was cancelled. In the year 2012, Baldev Kaur wife of Sahib Singh, Harvinder Singh (Meena), Raghbir Singh and Darshan Singh (petitioner) tried to encroach upon the vacant land on the backside of house No.52 and in that regard, a complaint was lodged with the police and at that time, the aforesaid persons produced a writing before the police, on which signatures of the complainant are fake. It is further stated in the FIR that on the basis of agreement of 1992, the accused party is trying to setup their claim, though the agreement was cancelled by father of the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is not a beneficiary of the agreement to sell of 1992 and being brother-in-law of Harvinder Singh, he is falsely implicated in the case and he is ready to join the investigation....”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, has not disputed the factual position and states that the petitioner is no more required for any further investigation.

In view of the above, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 07.05.2019 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

23.05.2019
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No