

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

103

**Date of Decision.:13.02.2024**

## Petitioner

## State of Punjab

Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**

\*\*\*\*

**DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)**

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.0007 dated 11.01.2023 registered under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station City Zira, District Ferozepur.

2. As it emerges on perusal of the paper book that one Pardeep Chaudhary was owner of land bearing 92 kanals 05 Marla in the area of Village Khatrian. Said Pardeep Chaudhary had donated his land to a Gaushala. On 10.12.2014, Pardeep Chaudhary was murdered in Sahibabad District, Ghaziabad. His wife Samruti along with three children became his legal heirs. It is alleged that on 06.09.2016, accused Harjinder Kaur, Sant Baba Bihla Das Chela Garib Das alias Sukhchain Singh, Pardeep Singh son of Baljinder Singh, Inder Singh Numberdar and Santokh Singh (petitioner) son of Surjit Singh, in connivance with each other executed a sale deed bearing Vasika No.1736 regarding property of Pardeep Chaudhary, in favour of Harjinder Kaur by producing a fake person, who impersonated as Pardeep Chaudhary. Later on, Harjinder Kaur in connivance

with Ravinder Jit Singh, Gurvir Singh and Pardeep Singh further sold the land in favour of Ravinder Jit Singh on 19.05.2017.

3. Complaint was made by Samruti wife of Pardeep Chaudhry through her Attorney Sant Gagan Dass. Inquiry was conducted and based on the report thereof, FIR was registered. It was found that petitioner- Santokh Singh was the master mind of the entire fraud. During inquiry, no evidence came to connect Ravinder Jit Singh with the crime. During investigation, accused Inder Singh was found to have already died. Baba Bihla Das @ Sukhchain Singh was arrested on 11.04.2023; whereas Pardeep Singh was arrested on 04.06.2023. After concluding investigation qua them, challan has already been filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner is not the beneficiary of sale deed.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court does not find the present case to be fit for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Dismissed.

( DEEPAK GUPTA )  
JUDGE

February 13, 2024  
Neetika Tuteja

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |