

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-6227-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-16.11.2020

Parvinder Singh @ Pinder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Nishan Singh Chahal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Sukhwinder Singh.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

CRM-17835-2020

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the applicant/petitioner is permitted to amend/correct the prayer clause of the petition. Sections 419, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC are ordered to be added in prayer clause of the petition.

CRM-27959-2020

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and amended memo of parties annexed with the application is taken on record.

CRM-M-6227-2020

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a registered vide FIR No.55 dated 9.3.2019 at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot under Sections 420, 120-B, 419, 465, 467, 468 and 471 of Indian Penal Code.
2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that accused Dr. Kuldeep Singh (since expired), Kewal Singh, Jugraj Singh, Parvinder Singh @ Pinder Singh (petitioner) Surjit Singh and Makhan Singh defrauded the complainant Kartar Kaur of an amount amount of ₹32 lakhs by selling her land by way of impersonation wherein the petitioner impersonated as one Surjit Singh.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that it is a case where infact the matter has been compromised amongst the parties and an amount of ₹22 lakhs out of the allegedly defrauded amount of ₹32 lakhs has already been paid back to the complainant. The learned counsel has further submitted that while co-accused Dr. Kuldeep Singh has expired, the other co-accused are already on bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel has submitted that although an amount of ₹22 lakhs has been paid to the complainant, but there is no compromise with the petitioner. The learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last more than 1 year and 3 months.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and while bearing in mind that an amount of ₹22 lakhs is stated to have been paid back to the complainant and that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the

last more than 1 year and 3 months, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Registry is directed to issue the order after incorporating the correct particulars regarding the address and the offences as per both the applications, which have been accepted today.

16.11.2020

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No