

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

CRM-M-9247-2021
Date of decision: 26.02.2021

Jaibir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Vijay Kumar Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Kumar Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 36 dated 15.01.2020, registered under Sections 120-B, 420, 506 of the IPC at Police Station Bhiwani Civil Lines, District Bhiwani.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was posted as Patwari and the allegations against him are that complainant Rajkalan has given a complaint that her husband has purchased a house bearing Khasra No. 33/17 measuring 5 Kanal 4 Marlas, vide registered sale deed dated 29.06.2018 and the mutation was entered into in his name on 21.06.2019. It is further stated that after taking possession of the said house, they locked the same and when during Diwali festival, they came back, they found that the lock was opened and two ladies and one man were sitting along with their luggage in the house.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner is a Govt. servant and he stands retired on 31.03.2019 and the mutation, which was entered into by the petitioner, was also verified by the

Kanungo and, therefore, no fault can be found on the part of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that two of the co-accused, namely Vir Singh and Rajbir, have already been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court.

Learned State counsel has opposed the bail on the ground that the entire controversy has arisen out of the said mutation, which was entered into by the petitioner showing some other person to be the owner of the property.

It is further submitted that the mutation of the property was already sanctioned in the name of the husband of the complainant in pursuance of a registered sale deed and, therefore, there was no occasion for the petitioner to enter into any second mutation on the basis of which, other accused have started claiming right over the said property.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, considering the serious allegations against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant him concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

26.02.2021

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No