

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

131

CRM-M-21438-2021

DATE OF DECISION: 03.06.2021

GURPREET SINGH

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF U.T. CHANDIGARH

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Ashish Soi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashu Mohan Punchhi, Public Prosecutor assisted by
Mr. Anupam Bansal, Asstt. Public Prosecutor
U.T., Chandigarh.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.63 dated 02.03.2021 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 452, 331, 344, 365, 386, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 473, 474, 477 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sector 39, Chandigarh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that although the petitioner is alleged to have impersonated Rahul Mehta but the petitioner was himself tricked by the other accused in the matter. The petitioner had signed as a witness but he was shown as an executant. He states that co-accused Arvind Singla and the petitioner were tricked into signing the documents.

Learned public prosecutor contends that the petitioner had impersonated as Rahul Mehta. He had signed as an executant while impersonating Rahul Mehta. He also contends that the GPA which was alleged to have been issued by Rahul Mehta in favour of accused Khalendra

Singh Kadyan was cancelled by impersonating him and the sale deed was also

executed by impersonation of Rahul Mehta by the petitioner. An account in the Corporation Bank had also been opened wherein the petitioner had also impersonated Rahul Mehta.

Heard.

The petitioner in connivance with the other accused is alleged to have defrauded the owner of the property. The GPA which was alleged to have been executed by Rahul Mehta, who was legal heir of the owner, in favour of co-accused Khalendra Singh Kadyan was allegedly cancelled by his impersonation by the petitioner. The sale deed is alleged to have been executed by impersonation of Rahul Mehta by the petitioner and the petitioner had also added the name of Rahul Mehta in the account of co-accused in the Corporation Bank by impersonation.

In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, I do not deem it appropriate to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

03.06.2021
SwarnjitS

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No
Whether reportable : Yes / No