

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.19285 of 2022  
Date of decision: 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2024

Sandeep

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Ravinder Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Haryana  
for the respondent/State.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.159 dated 01.04.2022 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 & 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 07.05.2022, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Rajesh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation. However, he has submitted that co-accused Vikram @ Vicky and Naresh Kumar had just witnessed the General Power of Attorney (GPA), which was made at Ghaziabad, and co-accused Raj Kumar Chawdhary being an

Advocate had drafted the GPA on the basis of the documents including the Aadhaar Card provided by the main accused Sandeep (present petitioner) and accused Ashok Kumar. Learned State counsel, on further instructions, has also submitted that the prime accused, in the case in hand, are the present petitioner and Ashok Kumar, who had impersonated the original owners of the property in question, i.e. Suman and Pawan, and thereafter, sold the same to the complainant.

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

5. As per the instructions received by the learned State counsel, the present petitioner is the prime accused in the case in hand, who had impersonated the original owners of the property in question and then sold the same to the complainant. In the circumstances, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition is dismissed.

6. 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.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

February 28, 2024

*rps*

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No