

**CRM-M-34095-2020 and
CRM-M-34281 of 2020**

[1]

209

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

CRM-M-34095-2020

Date of Decision: 04.11.2020

Gurmeet Singh

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

AND

CRM-M-34281-2020

Surinder Singh

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Parminder Walia, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-34095 of 2020.

Mr. IPS Kohli, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-34281 of 2020

Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, Deputy A.G., Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

[1] The matter is taken up for hearing through video
conference due to COVID-19 situation.

[2] By this common order these two petitions are being

disposed of as they are arising out of the same FIR.

[3] These petitions are filed by Gurmeet Singh and Surinder Singh respectively, seeking bail in FIR No.17, dated 21st February, 2020 under Section 120-B, 419, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Kalka, District Panchkula.

[4] The FIR was registered on an application of the Joint Sub Registrar, Kalka. The aggrieved person is Prem Kumar. The allegations are that Shubham son of Prem Kumar, in connivance with the co-accused, sold the property of his father and for registration of transaction someone impersonated as Prem Kumar.

[5] Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners were arrested on 14th July, 2020 and they are in detention since then. It is further argued that the payment of the sale amount was made through cheque, which was deposited in the joint account of Prem Kumar and his son.

[6] Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Singh Raj, submits that petitioners are witnesses. Further, it is argued that since the main accused i.e. Shubham has not been arrested, there is no substantial headway in the investigation. It is submitted that on arrest of Shubham, the petitioners may be required for custodial interrogation.

[7] At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that in case occasion so arises, the petitioners would immediately join investigation as and when desired by the police authorities.

**CRM-M-34095-2020 and
CRM-M-34281 of 2020**

[3]

[8] Considering the facts of the case, especially that there is no headway in the investigation and the contention that the payment of sale consideration was made through cheque, which was deposited in the joint account of Prem Kumar with his son, makes an arguable case in favour of the petitioners. The petitioners are granted bail subject to their furnishing surety bonds to the tune of ₹1,00,000/- each.

[9] The petitions are disposed of.

[10] However, it is made clear that any observation made hereinabove, would not be construed as opinion on the merits of the case.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

4th November, 2020
sham

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |