

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

**CRM-M-20354-2021(O&M)
Date of decision: 17.11.2021**

Ravinder Chauhan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.157 dated 13.04.2021, under Sections 406, 420 and 506 IPC, Police Station Gandhi Nagar, District Yamunanagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had purchased a plot vide sale deed dated 26.09.2018, executed by one Ruby Devi, previous owner of the said plot, and being a bona fide purchaser, the petitioner had sold the same to the wives of the complainants. It is further submitted that pursuance to the order dated 21.05.2021 passed by a Coordinate Bench, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel submits that as indicated in the reply dated 28.06.2021 filed by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, a report from the *Halqa Patwari* was sought and wherein it was reported that as per the revenue record i.e. *Jamabandi* for the year 2018-19, Rubi Devi, from whom the petitioner had purchased the plot, vide sale deed dated 26.09.2018, was not the owner of the same. The petitioner in connivance with co-accused Sanjay Chauhan had fraudulently sold the plot to the wives of the complainants, which was not owned by them.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner in connivance with co-accused Sanjay Chauhan, fraudulently sold the plot to the wives of the complainants, which was not owned by them. Even Rubi Devi from whom the petitioner purchased the plot was not the owner of the same. The chain of circumstances, thus clearly points out a high handed connivance and therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

In view of the above, the does not deserve concession of the anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

17.11.2021

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No