

CRM-M-4703-2022

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

CRM-M-4703-2022

Date of Decision: 07.02.2022

GURMEET SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Rajiv Goel, Advocate, for the petitioner.

(Through video conferencing)

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Prayer is for the grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.615 dated 23.12.2021 registered at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar, under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and Section 82 of Indian Registration Act, 1908.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner being an employe of M/s Sai Associates, had executed the sale deeds in favour of M/s Vinmehta Films Pvt. Ltd., on the asking of Satish Gupta, Director of M/s Sai Associates and Vishal Garg and Deepika Garg; that the petitioner is a poor person and he is neither beneficiary of the alleged sale deeds; nor an actual seller or purchaser thereof. It is further submitted that all the sale deeds were got executed from the petitioner by Satish Gupta, Vishal Garg and Deepika Garg, in connivance with each other and the petitioner had acted in a good faith, being an obedient employee of the Company. It is further submitted that co-accused Vishal Garg and Deepika

CRM-M-4703-2022

Garg, have been granted concession of interim bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 19.01.2022 in CRM-M-2152-2022.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, I do not find any merit in the present petition.

It may be noticed that the petitioner has not denied him having executed the sale deeds on behalf of M/s Sai Associates. The only defence taken by the petitioner is that he had acted as an obedient employee of the said Company. However, there cannot be no escape from the legal provisions, which required that the petitioner ought to have been in possession of a Resolution/Authority letter to execute the said sale deeds. Merely because, the petitioner has allegedly acted at the verbal instructions of the aforesaid persons, is no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is a must to unearth the racket of illegal sale/purchase of the land by the accused persons.

In view of the above, the present petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

07.02.2022
Amandeep

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