



218

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-19184-2024

Date of Decision:- 24.09.2024

NEELAM PATHANIA

....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. G.S. Attariwal, Advocate with
Mr.Gagandeep Singh Simble, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. O.S. Batalvi, Advocate for complainant.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.12 dated 24.01.2022 under Sections 420, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Sujanpur, District Pathankot.

2. As per facts of the case, Shweta Mahajan is the owner of property bearing khasra No.2245 (27-06) i.e. 17 1/2 marla situated in area Mamoon, District Pathankot. Renu Sharma wife of Manoj Kumar impersonated as Shweta Mahajan and sold the property to Neelam Kumari wife of Ramesh Singh Pathania. Manoj Kumar through Neelam Kumari again sold the property to Anita Raj wife of Mukhwinder Pal. When complainant came to know about said transactions, she enquired the matter and came to know that this property was sold by Manoj Kumar, Renu Sharma, Raman Kumar, Rajni Sharma, Neelam Pathania, Rajinder Kumar

Lamberdar, Amarjit Singh Lamberdar sahib, Joginder Thakur, an employee of Tehsil Complex Pathankot namely Parmod Kumar, Computer Operator, Daniel Masih Junior Nazir in the office of Pathankot in connivance with each other to grab the property standing in the name of Shweta Mahajan.

3. Learned counsel for petitioners argued that Manoj Kumar had raised loan of Rs.5 lakhs from the petitioner. He showed his inability to return the amount and told him that he has purchased a plot in her name. She was not aware of said transaction. When petitioner again raised demand for her money, Manoj Kumar and his wife Renu Sharma told her to sell the property purchased in her name at Pathankot and out of this, her money was returned and rest of money was received by wife of Manoj Kumar. Even petitioner did not appear as purchaser of the property. One Rajni Sharma had appeared as purchaser. She is ready to join the investigation as and when required. Therefore, her anticipatory bail may be allowed.

4. Learned counsel representing State argued that petitioner has joined the investigation on 06.05.2024 and she is not required for any other purpose.

5. Learned counsel for complainant has not opposed the anticipatory bail application filed by Neelam Pathania by arguing that she herself did not know about disputed transaction.

6. Considering the aforesaid factual position, present petitioner has already joined the investigation. As per learned counsel representing State, she is not required for any other purpose. Her anticipatory bail is not opposed by counsel for the complainant. Therefore, interim bail already

detailed under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

7. Petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

24.09.2024

snd

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No.

Whether reportable: Yes/No

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE