

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

209

CRM-M-49046-2021

Date of Decision: 02.12.2021

Ved Pal ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by SI Alok Kumar.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.660 dated 03.10.2021 at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh, under Sections 148/149/387/365 IPC and Sections 25/29 of the Arms Act.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Ballu Saini, wherein it is alleged that on 03.10.2021, when he was having tea at a shop at Nizampur road, Vikram, Amit @ Monu, Sukhdeep, Pela, Pandey & others came there and started beating him and also threatened him to either vacate the land which the accused had purchased for Rs.1 crore or to pay an amount of Rs.1 crore to the accused. It is alleged that earlier he had paid an amount of Rs.2 lakh to Billu Dublana as protection money to get rid of this, but he

(Billu Dublana) made the complainant talk to Bikram Baldu telephonically and who also threatened him to either pay Rs.1 crore or to vacate the land. It is also alleged that the accused had also tried to kidnap him, but he managed to escape.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the instant case and in fact he is nowhere named in the FIR and is now sought to be nominated as an accused on the premises that the real name of 'Pandey', who is mentioned in the FIR, is 'Ved Pal'. It has been submitted that the petitioner otherwise has a clean record and is not involved in any other case.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that during investigation, it has been found that 'Pandey' is also known as 'Ved Pal' and that he was part of a bigger gang, which was operating as land *mafia* and had been grabbing lands in the locality by force and as such, he does not deserves the concession of anticipatory bail. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that while all other co-accused have a chequered record, the instant petitioner is not involved in any other case.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. There indeed appears to be some kind of ambiguity as regards the name of the petitioner, who as per prosecution is referred to as 'Pandey' in the FIR, but is now stated to be also called by the name 'Ved Pal'. In any case, the petitioner is stated to be having a clean record though the co-accused are stated to be involved in several cases of land grabbing. In these circumstances, this Court is of the

opinion that the concession of anticipatory bail could be extended to the petitioner particularly keeping in view his clean record. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner, in the event of his arrest, be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Arresting/Investigating Officer and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

02.12.2021

Vimal

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

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