

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

**CRM-M-27365 of 2020(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 29.10.2020**

Manmohan Singh @ Sheriya

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present : Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate,
For the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate
For the complainant.
(Presence marked through video conference).

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 93 dated 17.08.2020, registered under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Satnali, District Mohindergarh.

2. Per complainant Vijay Singh, the petitioner and his father Basant Singh forged the revenue record and fraudulently entered into agreement to sell 40 kanals land and received Rs.7 lacs. The accused assured the complainant to purchase his 32 kanals of land and after issuing four cheques, totalling Rs.46,15,000/-, they got the same registered vide sale-deeds dated 1443 and 1444. The cheques, on presentation, got dishonoured, except one for Rs.4 lacs. Neither the land was transferred in the name of complainant nor the amount was returned.

3. On 13.1.2020 when the matter was taken up, following order was passed:-

“After arguing for some time, when this Court showed disinclination to interfere, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he be given an opportunity to seek instructions from his client if he is willing to settle the matter.”

4. Today, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has instructions to say that the petitioner is not in a position to make settlement with the complainant. He, however, submits that the petitioner is not a beneficiary of the alleged transaction and Basant Singh is the beneficiary.

5. The petitioner is son of Basant Singh, It is specifically stated in the FIR that the amount of Rs.7 lacs was received by the petitioner at the time agreement to sell 40 kanals of land was entered, on the basis of forged revenue record. It is for the investigating agency to ascertain the role of the petitioner in entire episode/transaction, which can only be ascertained during interrogation.

6. Taking into account aforesaid facts and gravity of the alleged in which petitioner is implicated, he is not entitled to benefit of any protection.

7. Petition for anticipatory bail is accordingly dismissed.

OCTOBER 29, 2020

Jiten

(ARUN MONGA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No