

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

CRM-M-20605-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-17.9.2021

Harpinder Singh @ Juj

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Ranbir Singh Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Harnek Singh.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in a case registered vide FIR No.251 dated 18.12.2019 under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/471/120-B IPC at Police Station Guru Harsahai, District Ferozepur.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Prince Kamboj, wherein he has levelled allegations against Sajjan Singh, Balvir Kaur, Virsa Singh, Paramjit Kaur, Surmukh Singh, Sukhraj Kaur, Jagjit Singh @ Jagga, Harpinder Singh @ Judge (petitioner) and six unidentified persons including two women. It has been alleged therein that complainant's father Nek Raj

received a telephone call from mobile No.8475006313 of Sajjan Singh, who represented that some land was available for sale at cheap rates. Subsequently, a property dealer namely Virsa Singh also called complainant's father on mobile phone and offered to show the land in question, upon which the complainant's father called them in village Panje Ke Uttarh where Virsa Singh, Surmukh Singh @ Tota Singh and Sajjan Singh came in their car and represented that land measuring 32 acres and 4 kanals, situated in village Rerwan was available for sale. The complainant's father liked the land and agreed to purchase the same. On 7.10.2019, Sajjan Singh, Virsa Singh, accompanied by imposter Sandeep Singh and imposter Gurmit Singh, who were impersonating as such, came to their house. Later, the complainant came to know that the person, who was impersonating as Sandeep Singh, was infact Harpinder Singh @ Judge and the person impersonating as Gurmit Singh was infact Jagjit Singh @ Jagga son of Hari Singh. They were accompanied by unidentified men and a woman. A deal was settled for sale of land @ ₹6 lacs per acre and an amount of ₹4 lacs was given as earnest money and an agreement was executed. Subsequently, an amount of ₹6 lacs was transferred into the account of Sandeep Singh on 19.10.2019. It is further the case of prosecution that another amount of ₹20 lacs was transferred by way of RTGS transactions in the account of aforesaid Sandeep Singh who was infact impersonating as such. On 22.10.2019, another amount of ₹20 lacs is stated to have been transferred in the account of imposter Gurmit Singh. It is also the case of prosecution that subsequently, another amount of ₹6 lacs was also transferred into the account of imposter Gurmit Singh-accused. It is, thus, the case of prosecution that the land was infact owned by Sandeep Singh, Gurmit Singh and Nirmaljit Kaur whereas the

same was sought to be sold by the accused by way of impersonation. The prosecution alleges that the complainant's father had, thus, been duped for an amount of ₹85 lacs.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the instant case and that there is no evidence worth credence to show that the amount of ₹85 lacs had been received by the accused. It has further been submitted that the investigation in any case is complete and further detention of the petitioner is not required for any purpose.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since there are specific and categoric allegations levelled against the accused Sajjan Singh and Virsa Singh to the effect that they had held out a false representation to the complainant regarding sale of land and had introduced him to two imposters Sandeep Singh and Gurmit Singh, whose real identity was infact Harpinder Singh (petitioner) and Jagjit Singh, no case for grant of bail is made out. The learned State counsel has, however, not disputed the fact that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 1 year and 2 months and that he is not involved in any other case. It has further been informed that charges are yet to be framed and that as many as 14 prosecution witnesses have been cited by the prosecution.
5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, especially that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 1 year and 2 months and is not stated to be involved in any other case and that trial is yet to commence, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as conclusion of trial is likely to consume time. The petition, as

such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

17.9.2021

pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No