

287/2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-19197-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 23.07.2024

HARJOT KAUR Vs. ...Petitioner
STATE OF PUNJAB ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present: Mr. Parvez Chugh, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. M. S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Aman Pratap Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Joginder Pal Batra, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail on 25.04.2024, this Court had noticed the following contentions:-

“The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to her in case FIR No.0047 dated 29.03.2024 registered under Sections 420, 120-B, 447, 511 of IPC, at Police Station Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

The FIR in the present case was got registered by Jeet Singh, complainant by alleging that Navjot Kaur had sold 13 K-12 M of land to him, which was situated at village Dhigana, Tehsil and District Sri Muktsar Sahib. The documents were verified at the time of execution of the registered sale deed and were found to be correct. However, when he went to the Patwari for sanctioning of the mutation, it was found that loan of Rs.1,46,46,085/- was outstanding against the property in question. It was also alleged that the accused had moved an application before the SDM, Sri Muktsar Sahib and the mutation was contested and was declared as a disputed and the said case is still pending. It was also alleged by the complainant that the accused had committed cheating by selling their land and now they were threatening him of his life and wanted to dispossess him. With these broad allegations, the FIR in the present case was got registered by the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the present case, the registered sale deed was executed by Navjot Kaur, sister of the present petitioner only. He further

contends that the petitioner was neither seller nor witness nor property dealer nor beneficiary of the sale deed in any manner. Learned counsel has further relied upon the order dated 15.04.2024, passed by this Court, whereby the concession of anticipatory bail has been granted to the similarly placed co-accused Parkhjit Singh (husband of the present petitioner). ”

2. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner has already joined the investigation and is no longer required for the purpose of investigation.
3. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, the interim order dated 25.04.2024 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

23.07.2024
M.Sikka

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No