

106

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

**CRM-M-55412-2023 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 08.11.2023**

Chetan @ Gaurav

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU**

Present: Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kiran Pal Singh, AAG, Haryana.

**MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.**

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.207 dated 05.05.2023, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477, 506 & 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, '*the IPC*'), registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar.

2. Allegations are that the petitioner along with other co-accused impersonated Jethu Ram (deceased), who was the owner of disputed land and fraudulently got the sale deed registered on 07.01.2022. Thereafter, mutation was also sanctioned in favour of co-accused Anita.

3. Learned counsel contends that petitioner is not the beneficiary and co-accused Anita has already been granted the concession of interim pre-arrest bail by this Court on 06.10.2023. Also contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

4. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer, submitted that petitioner played an active role in the commission of crime and thus, he does not deserve the concession of pre-arrest bail.
5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.
6. It transpires that petitioner is involved in 12 other criminal cases and apart that, he is also a convict in murder case. In the present case, allegations are that petitioner after hatching a conspiracy with other co-accused, by impersonation and misrepresentation of facts, got registered the sale deed No.18195 dated 07.01.2022 as well as mutation No.26742 in favour of co-accused Anita. In such a scenario, to find out the truth, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be the only way out.
7. Therefore, keeping in view the allegations and antecedents of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to accept the prayer.
8. As a result thereof, there is no option except to dismiss the petition.
9. Ordered accordingly.
10. It is clarified that observations made above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the controversy, in any manner.
11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

**08.11.2023**  
*atulsethi*

**(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)**  
**JUDGE**

|                                             |                   |                  |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| <b><i>Whether speaking / reasoned :</i></b> | <b><i>Yes</i></b> | <b><i>No</i></b> |
| <b><i>Whether Reportable :</i></b>          | <b><i>Yes</i></b> | <b><i>No</i></b> |