

**206**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT**  
**CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-21971-2022**  
**Date of Decision: 15.07.2022**

Veena Chadha

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present: Mr. Varun Katyal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Davinder Bir Singh, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.53 dated 30.03.2022, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC, registered at Police Station City, Hoshiarpur.

The present FIR was lodged on the basis of orders of the learned Magistrate for lodging of FIR against the petitioner and other co-accused on the ground that the petitioner is involved in FIR pertaining to proceedings under Section 498A/406/324 IPC, Police Station City, Hoshiarpur which is pending before the Court of learned Magistrate wherein accused Jeet Kaur had furnished surety bonds on behalf of the present petitioner namely Veena Chanda and the surety bond was attested by Surjit Singh being Lambardar of the Village Jian and also another

witness namely, Shiv Ram and thereafter on finding some doubts in the fard jamabandi alongwith documents, the same were sent to Tehsildar, Hoshiarpur for its verification. It has been reported by the Tehsildar, Hoshiarpur that as per report received from the Halqa Patwari all the documents furnished at the time of furnishing surety were fake and in this way, the petitioner Veena Chadha in connivance with the other three co-accused had forged the documents which they had used as genuine and thereby cheated the Court by furnishing fake documents for surety purposes.

Notice was issued by this Court and the State has already filed reply in the present case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the furnishing of surety by way of forged documents was not in the knowledge of the petitioner and she was not aware of the same and, therefore, the present FIR is not sustainable against her. He has therefore prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, Mr. Davinder Bir Singh, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab while referring to para No.4 of the affidavit filed by the State submitted that the Investigating Officer of the present case visited the village Jian to verify the names and addresses of accused Jeet Kaur, Surjit Singh and Shiv Ram and recorded the statements of Surjit Singh, Lambardar and Paramjit Kaur, Sarpanch of the village Jian on 26.04.2022. The aforesaid Surjit Singh, Lambardar and Paramjit Kaur, Sarpanch stated in their statement that the aforesaid co-accused Jeet Kaur, Surjit Singh and Shiv Ram whose identity cards and aadhar cards were

shown to them are not residents of village Jian and ID card and Aadhar Card of Lambardar Surjit Singh and Aadhar Cards of Shiv Ram and Jeet Kaur are forged and fabricated. The police is still trying their best to locate the Jeet Kaur, Shiv Ram and Surjit Singh as they were not found to be residents of Village Jian. He further submitted that the documents used by the aforesaid persons for furnishing surety bonds were forged and fabricated and the beneficiary of the same was the petitioner who was granted anticipatory bail by this Court. He further submitted that it was on the basis of complaint made by the learned Magistrate that the present FIR was lodged and the present offence is not only serious but also affects the administration of justice and, therefore, has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

As per the learned counsel for the parties, the petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this Court and thereafter, when surety bonds were executed by one Jeet Kaur in the presence of two witnesses namely, Surjit Singh and Shiv Ram, the documents and the fard jamabandi were found to be forged and fabricated. Thereafter, an inquiry was also conducted by the Investigating Officer and these all the three persons were not the residents of the village which was mentioned in the documents by which they furnished surety bonds. The argument raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner that she was not aware of the aforesaid facts is not sustainable in view of the fact that surety bonds were executed for the purpose of bail for the petitioner and the petitioner was direct beneficiary of the same. During the course of arguments, the learned State counsel also

interrogation of the petitioner is required in order to ascertain as to how she managed the fabrication of revenue records and other documents. The argument raised by learned State counsel does carry weight. Therefore, this Court is of the view that considering the seriousness and gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is meant for the purpose of deciding the present petition only.

**15.07.2022**

rakesh

**(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)**  
**JUDGE**

|                    |   |        |
|--------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking   | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable | : | Yes/No |