

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

CRM-M-11621-2019 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:- 26.2.2020

Manjit Kaur ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present:- Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.**

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against her vide FIR No.10 dated 29.12.2018 under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/ 471/ 120-B IPC at Police Station NRI Amritsar, District Amritsar.
2. The FIR in question was registered at the instance of Surjit Singh wherein it has been alleged that he is a resident of Germany and had never come to India after 2011. He had purchased land measuring 422.33 square yards in village Nangli, Tehsil and District Amritsar from Sukhdeep Kaur vide sale deed dated 13.5.1999. However, a few days back when he visited the said property, he saw that some construction was going on his plot. Upon enquiries, he came to know that sale deed in respect of his property has been executed in favour of Manjit Kaur, who had further sold the same to Vikram Mehra and Rajesh Kumar and the said persons further sold the same to Neeru, Pooja and Sunita vide sale deed dated 23.11.2016. It is alleged that the complainant had never executed any power of attorney or any sale

deed in favour of Manjit Kaur and that his property has been sold by way of impersonation.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that she has falsely been implicated in the present case and that the alleged impersonator is some other Manjit Kaur and not the present petitioner.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that during the course of investigation, it had surfaced that the petitioner had got one bank account opened with another impersonator, who was impersonating as Surjit Singh in Axis Bank wherein an amount of ₹ 20 lacs had been transferred, which were infact the proceeds of the sale in question. The learned State counsel has shown a photocopy of the 'account opening form' wherein a photograph of the petitioner Manjit Kaur is affixed. Although, the learned counsel for the petitioner has disputed her signatures but has been unable to dispute the photograph, as affixed on the 'account opening form'. The learned State counsel has further submitted that the record pertaining to registration of sale deeds in question was also collected which also shows that the photograph of the petitioner Manjit Kaur is there in the record of registration of sale deeds in the office of Sub-Registrar. The learned State counsel has thus, prayed for dismissal of anticipatory bail.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Keeping in view the record collected by the investigating agency during the course of investigation which clearly shows that the petitioner had not only visited the office of the Sub-Registrar for the purpose of executing the sale deed in question but had also opened an account with one Surjit Singh

wherein huge amount of ₹ 20 lacs had been transferred, the complicity of the petitioner is clearly evident. In these circumstances, no special case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

7. The petition is sans any merits and is hereby dismissed.

**26.2.2020**

kamal

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)**  
**Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No