

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-23106-2023

Date of decision: 12.07.2023

Ram Lal Numberdar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. K.B.S. Mann, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.46 dated 24.02.2023 under Sections 420, 120 B, 419, 465, 467, 468 and 471 of the IPC registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that totally false allegations have been levelled against the petitioner of having induced the complainant to purchase the property in question from co-accused Varinderpal Singh and Maninderjit Singh. He submits that the petitioner was not even a beneficiary of the transaction in question as there was no material to show that he had forged and fabricated any document much less cheated the complainant.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant while opposing and controverting the

submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, has submitted that Varinderpal Singh and Maninderjit Singh were imposters who entered into an agreement to sell the land to complainant Harcharan Singh and for which earnest money too was paid. Both the imposters were identified by none other than the petitioner and there was a deposit of ₹3 lakhs made in the account of the petitioner. Hence, it was evident that the petitioner in connivance with the co-accused had cheated the complainant to the tune of ₹ 30 lakhs. Learned State counsel submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

5. Prima facie there are specific and serious allegations levelled against the petitioner of having cheated the complainant to the tune of ₹ 30 lakhs. As submitted by learned State counsel, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessary in the case. In the facts and circumstances, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is dismissed.

7. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12.07.2023

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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