

involved in the crime as alleged against him in the present case. Even as per the story of the prosecution, the entries in the revenue record are pertaining to an office, in which the petitioner was never posted. Therefore, the petitioner deserves to be protected against his arrest. It is further submitted by the learned counsel that the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to cooperate with the Investigating Officer as and when called by the police.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, being instructed by PSI Kamaljeet Singh and being assisted by Mr. S.S.Salar, counsel for the complainant, has submitted that the petitioner has himself committed the fraud by deleting the name of his uncle from the revenue record. The petitioner and his father were the only beneficiaries in the case. Even if, the same has been done by some other authority, then also, the participation of the petitioner is very much evident from the benefit driven by his family. Otherwise also, the concerned revenue record was transferred from Tehsil Narayangarh to Tehsil Kalka and the petitioner was very much posted in Tehsil Kalka from 1.07.1979 to 31.03.1982. Therefore, the police require the custodial interrogation of the petitioner to unearth the true dimensions of the alleged crime committed by the petitioner, as well as, to find out the names of his any other accomplice.

5. In view of the facts and circumstances available on the file, as well as, the submissions made by the learned State counsel, this Court does not find it appropriate to interfere in the matter, at this stage, so as to grant

CRM-M-29972-2023

-3-

concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Dismissed.

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)
JUDGE

31.08.2023
adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No