

221

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

CRM-M-18921 of 2022

Amarjeet @ Amarjit Singh

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CRM-M-19006 of 2022

Vijay Kumar @ Vijay Singh

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Date of decision: 10.08.2022

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present:- Mr. Vishal Munjal Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amit Mehta, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Onkar Singh Batalvi, Advocate
for the complainant.

Reply by way of affidavit of Mr. Rajinder Singh, PPS, Deputy
Superintendent of Police, Sub Division, Dhar Kalan, Pathankot on behalf of
respondent No.1 is taken on record.

These two petitions as filed seeking regular bail in FIR No.206 dated
05.10.2021 under Sections 417, 419, 420, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC (45
of 1860) registered at Police Station Sujampur, Tehsil and District Pathankot.

As per the case set up, the petitioners along with Manoj Kumar
Nannu Sharma, Raman Kumar, Joginder Thakur, Parbodh Kumar and Daniel
Masih by impersonation had sold land of complainant and of Shaweta Mahajan

measuring 1 Kanal 12.37 Marlas and 1 Kanal 6 Marlas situated in the Revenue Estate of Village Mamoon Tehsil and District Pathankot. The role attributed to the petitioners are that they were the attesting witnesses to the sale deed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are in custody since 02.02.2022 and 27.01.2022 respectively. They are not the beneficiaries. The petitioners being co-villagers of co-accused in good faith signed as the attesting witnesses. It is argued that no recovery is to be made.

The learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer, submits that Amarjeet Singh is involved in one more FIR.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant, opposes the prayer, submits that the anticipatory bail of the petitioner was dismissed by this Court and the order was upheld by the Supreme Court. He further submits that the co-accused are not being arrested by the Police, inspite of dismissal of their anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of case, the role attributed to petitioners in totality and that conclusion of trial is likely to take time, the petitioners are granted regular bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petitions are allowed.

It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

August 10, 2022
sonia

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>