

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

CRM-M-33447-2019 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:- 17.2.2020

Jagjit Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.**(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of FIR No.138, dated 5.7.2019, Police Station Civil Lines, Amritsar City, District Amritsar, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Sh. Gurdev Singh Dham, Sub-Registrar-II, Amritsar, wherein it has been alleged that on 22.3.2019, petitioner-Jagjit Singh appeared before him for the purpose of registration of Special Power of Attorney in favour of one Ravi Sharma and for the said purpose he produced one Special Power of Attorney dated 14.5.2003 in his favour purported to have been

executed by Gurnam Kaur. It is the case of prosecution that the aforesaid Jagjit Singh claimed himself to be an attorney of Gurnam Kaur on the basis of Power of Attorney executed vide Vasika No.1941 dated 14.5.2003, page No.62, Bahi No.1162. However, since the complainant/Sub-Registrar-II got suspicious about the said Power of Attorney dated 14.5.2003, he asked the petitioner to produce the original Power of Attorney dated 14.5.2003 but the same was not produced. Later when the complainant checked the record, it was found that no such Power of Attorney had ever been registered vide Vasika No.1941 dated 14.5.2003, page No.62, Bahi No.1162, and in fact the document entered at Vasika No.1941 pertained to some other person by the name of Sarabjit Singh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and there is nothing to connect him with the alleged fraud and that in any case no loss has been caused to the complainant/Gurnam Kaur.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel, has submitted that in the present case the complicity of the petitioner is evident from the facts inasmuch as the stamp paper on which the Power of Attorney dated 14.5.2003 in favour of petitioner has been prepared, was in fact purchased on 25.2.2019 whereas the contents typed thereon are to the effect that said Power of Attorney was executed on 14.5.2003. It has further been submitted that Gurnam Kaur owner of the property in question, in any case, had expired on 6.9.2004 and that even if any

such Power of Attorney had been executed on 14.5.2003, the same would have become redundant after her death.

5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. Keeping in view the aforestated position where the petitioner has apparently forged Power of Attorney dated 14.5.2003 on stamp paper purchased on 25.2.2019 this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail.
6. There is no merit in the petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

**February 17, 2020**  
mohan

**( GURVINDER SINGH GILL )**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No