

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

226

CRM-M-42190-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.12.2022

Manish Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.218 dated 26.05.2022, registered at Police Station Sadar Pehowa, District Kurukshetra, under Sections 420 and 506 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations against the petitioner is regarding the change of *khasra* numbers in the sale deed; that the complainant party was to purchase particular *khasra* numbers of the land, as specifically mentioned in the said agreement, and that the same *khasra* numbers as mentioned in the agreement, had been sold to the complainant party, vide registered sale deed dated 11.03.2022.

Learned counsel further contends that there was no question of changing the *khasra* numbers of the land; that the *khasra* numbers in the agreement to sell and sale deed are same; that the petitioner has not

committed any fraud with the complainant, and that though the petitioner is not the owner of the land in question, yet he had put his signatures only on the agreement to sell on behalf of his mother-Sunhari Devi, who is a co-sharer in the land in question. He further contends that the sale deed dated 11.03.2022 was executed by Sunhari Devi before the Sub Registrar, in favour of one Narinder Kaur, but the above-noted FIR has been got registered by Paramjit Kaur.

Vide order dated 14.09.2022, *ad interim* anticipatory bail was granted to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the aforesaid order dated 14.09.2022, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Ram Niwas, submits that though the petitioner has joined the investigation, but the recovery of Rs.1,08,96,000/- is yet to be effected to be effected from him.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

In view of the above, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 14.09.2022 granting *ad interim* anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to the conditions envisaged in Section 438 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

12.12.2022

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No