

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

205

CRM-M-38927-2020

DATE OF DECISION: 18.11.2021

TARSEM SINGH @ VIBHAV SINGH

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Ms. Harpreet Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Navkiran Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Anshika, Advocate for the complainant.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 303 dated 05.11.2019, under Sections 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' - for short) (Sections 467, 468 and 471 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Jamalpur, District Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations are that the signatures of the vendor had been forged in the agreements to sell entered into between the vendor and the petitioner and his brother as vendees. The agreements to sell were executed on 18.08.2006 and 18.04.2007. The vendor Lakhwinder Singh is stated to have expired on 21.03.2008 and the petitioner had filed a suit for specific performance on 12.08.2008 wherein the LR's of late Lakhwinder Singh were served and had filed written statement. The suit was decreed on 11.12.2013 and in the meantime the LR's had sold the suit land to another person who in turn sold the same to the complainant. He also contends that the complainant has filed an application for setting aside the decree which is pending adjudication before the Civil Court. The petitioner had earlier been granted anticipatory bail by the trial Court, as FIR was

registered under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC and thereafter Sections 467, 468 and 471 IPC were added.

Learned counsel for the complainant states that the FSL report establishes that the signatures of the vendor on the agreements to sell were forged and, therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

This Court, by the order dated 25.11.2020, had directed the petitioner to appear before the Investigating Officer and join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he was ordered to be released on ad-interim bail to the satisfaction of the Investigating/Arresting Officer, subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Learned State counsel, upon instructions from ASI Arjinder Singh, states that the petitioner has joined investigation.

In view of the above and the petitioner having joined investigation, the order dated 25.11.2020 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute.

However, the petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. He shall also join investigation as and when called upon to do so.

The petition stands disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

18.11.2021

SwarnjitS

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