



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-25951-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-8.7.2024

Satish Gorge @ Satish George ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Sudeep Bhargava, Advocate with
Ms. Ojaswini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
0364	7.10.2022	Bhiwani Civil Lines, Bhiwani, Haryana	120-B, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of Indian Penal Code

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

CRM-26548-2024

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the documents annexed with the application are taken on record as Annexures P-14 to P-18 subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-25951-2024 (Main Case)

- The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of the aforementioned FIR.



CRM-M-25951-2024 (O&M)

(2)

2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that on 1.9.2022 Shri Sumit Nath Attorney/Legal Representative of Baptist Missionary Society Corporation, India (in short hereinafter referred to as 'the BMSC') made a complaint to the Superintendent of Police, Bhiwani alleging therein that one Satish George and his accomplices, in connivance with government officials, had hatched a criminal conspiracy to dispose of properties owned by the BMSC including a plot measuring 20 kanals 11 marlas situated at Hansi Gate, Bhiwani on the basis of forged and fabricated documents, in favour of Jaljeet Malik and Rajesh Kumar. 3. Pursuant to receipt of the aforesaid complaint, the matter was inquired into by the Additional Superintendent of Police, Bhiwani and the allegations, as levelled by the complainant, were *prima facie* found to be correct and accordingly the FIR in question i.e. FIR No. 364 dated 7.10.2022, Police Station Civil Lines, Bhiwani came to be lodged against more than 9 accused namely Satish George, Jaljeet Malik, Rajesh, Liyakat Khan, Rohit Phogat, Sajjan Verma, Deed Writer, Ombir Lambardar, Vikas Registry Clerk and Ravinder Malik Tehsildar and others.
3. During the course of investigation, resolution dated 17.3.2022 as well as letter dated 17.3.2022 and also letter dated 1.10.2022 vide which Satish George was shown to have been appointed as President of the BMSC were got verified and it was found that the address of the parties as well as the official address of the Society were false and that all these documents were forged and fabricated documents. It was on the basis of the said forged and fabricated documents that a sale deed in respect of the property in question was purportedly executed and was said to be got registered in a fraudulent

*CRM-M-25951-2024 (O&M)*

(3)

manner. It is further the case of prosecution that although the property is worth more than Rs. 50 crores but was sought to be sold for Rs.1,72,01,625/-. It was further found that while as per the said sale deed dated 5.9.2022, an amount of Rs. 1,72,01,625/- was paid to the Society but as per the complainant, not even a single penny had been credited into the account of the Society and nor any other document was found indicating payment of such amount.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and that in any case he is not the beneficiary of the alleged fraudulent transaction and, as such, he deserves the concession of bail particularly on account of the fact that the main accused Jaljeet Malik has already been enlarged on bail.
5. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submitted that it was on account of forged documents prepared by the petitioner that the colossal fraud came to be perpetuated and that in these circumstances he does not deserve the concession of bail. It has further been informed that the petitioner happens to be involved in two other cases of identical nature. Learned State counsel informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 8 months and the charges are yet to be framed and as many as 53 PWs have been cited.
6. Without commenting anything as regards merits of the case, but having regard to the custody of the petitioner i.e. about 8 months and also the fact that conclusion of trial is likely to take some time as charges are yet to be



CRM-M-25951-2024 (O&M) (4)

framed and as many as 53 PWs have been cited, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8.7.2024

Geeta

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No