

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

Sr.No.206

CRM-M No.25432 of 2021

Date of Decision: 26.08.2021

Gurdip Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Samina Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

Apprehending his arrest in the criminal case pertaining to the FIR bearing No.65 dated 15.06.2021 registered at Police Station Mehta, District Amritsar, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, the petitioner has preferred this petition for seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

Bereft of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled in the subject FIR, are that the petitioner forged an exchange-deed qua the transfer of the property of his mother in his own name and got the mutation sanctioned on the basis thereof.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel in the present petition and have also perused the

.....

file thoroughly.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the complainant happens to be the mother of the petitioner and the said FIR is the outcome of the dispute between the complainant and the wife as well as the sister of the petitioner and moreover, the petitioner has also transferred his share in the property to his mother vide the said exchange-deed and in these circumstance, he deserves the relief as prayed for in this petition.

Per contra, learned State counsel argues that the petitioner had forged the said exchange-deed and had also got the mutation sanctioned by the Revenue Authorities on the basis of the same and keeping in view the gravity of the offence as committed by him (petitioner), this petition be dismissed.

In para No.5 of the status-report, it has categorically been mentioned that as per the report of the FSL, the divergences in the writing habits found between the specimen signatures of the complainant, as obtained in the presence of the Tehsildar and the questioned signatures on the said exchange-deed were due to different authorship and that the FIR was registered after conducting the detailed inquiry in the matter and the petitioner had also got the mutation sanctioned on the basis of the said forged exchange-deed. It being so, the contentions raised qua the present FIR being the outcome of any dispute in the family and the complainant having got some property by virtue of

.....

the said exchange-deed pale into insignificance at this stage and the same can and shall be looked into and adjudicated upon by the trial Court after appreciating and evaluating the evidence as may be led on the record during the course of the trial.

Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances as well as the gravity of the offence as alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that he does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail. Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed.

However, it is clarified that nothing contained here-in-before shall be construed to be an expression of the opinion of this Court on the merits of this case.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

26.08.2021
neetu

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>No</i>