

**CRM-M-50375-2018**

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

**CRM-M-50375-2018 (O& M)**

**Date of Decision: 22.04.2019**

Kuljeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH**

Present: Mr. J.S.Thind, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate,  
for respondent No.2.

**INDERJIT SINGH, J.**

**CRM-12712-2019**

Allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

Annexures P-5 to P-9 are taken on record.

**CRM-M-50375-2018**

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 (2) Cr.P.C.  
for cancellation of bail granted to respondent No.2 by learned Additional  
Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, vide order dated 21.09.2018, in case FIR  
No.213 dated 10.08.2018, registered at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran,  
District Tarn Taran, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the IPC.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State

**CRM-M-50375-2018**

counsel has appeared on behalf of respondent No.1-State and respondent No.2 has also appeared through his counsel. They contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and gone through the record.

At the time of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has not argued that after the grant of anticipatory bail to respondent No.2-Jatinder Singh, he has misused the concession of the same. There is nothing argued that respondent No.2 is tampering with the evidence or giving any threat to the witnesses etc.

The only argument raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, bail should not have been granted to respondent No.2 by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going through the record, I find that on 10.08.2018, FIR was got registered by the complainant against respondent No.2-Jitender Singh etc. As per the averments in the FIR, mutation of exchange was entered on 28.09.1995 and the present FIR was registered after about 23 years. In the year 1995, the complainant was 20 years of age, as argued. It is stated that affidavit regarding exchange was a forged document. The case is based on documentary evidence. Respondent No.2-accused, Jatinder Singh, is not required for custodial interrogation. Moreover, he has already joined the investigation as per the order passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran.

**CRM-M-50375-2018**

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, I find that no ground is made out for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2, vide order dated 21.09.2018 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran.

Finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

**22.04.2019**

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

|              |                           |   |     |
|--------------|---------------------------|---|-----|
| <b>Note:</b> | Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes |
|              | Whether reportable        | : | No  |