

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-24013-2019

Date of decision: 29.05.2019

Naveen Rana

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

PRESENT: Mr. Amaninder Preet, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 114 dated 23.05.2018, registered under Sections 419, 420, 467, 471 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Bajghera, District Gurugram.

According to the prosecution, the petitioner in conspiracy with his accomplice fraudulently by impersonation, transferred the land of deceased-Om Parkash, who died in the year 1993, father of complainant-Sudhir Sachdeva, measuring 19 marlas situated in village Chauma, Tehsil and District Gurgaon, vide registered sale deed No. 24231 dated 30.12.2015 and got sanctioned mutation No. 13801 dated 16.02.2016 in favour of Angel Buildtec Pvt. Ltd.

Learned counsel *inter alia* contends that petitioner is not the beneficiary of alleged transaction. He has falsely been implicated in the

instant case. He only as a attesting witness, attested the aforesaid sale deed, on the asking of one Mehar Singh Rana, who is working with the accused-Company. Petitioner is in custody since the date of his arrest. Conclusion of trial may take sufficient long time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him behind bars.

On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposing the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner is the main accused being master mind of entire forgery and fraud. He affixing his own photograph got prepared fake driving licence and aadhar card of deceased-Om Parkash and on the basis thereof, executed and registered aforesaid sale deed in favour of Angel Buildtec Pvt. Ltd. He also opened a bank account, which now has been seized.

Having given thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions and considering the seriousness of allegations levelled against the petitioner of committing a fraud of huge amount of ₹46,50,000/-, this Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

May 29, 2019
rishu

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No