



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

CRM-M-26298-2024

DECIDED ON: 23.05.2024

SITA RAM

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. B.S. Aulakh, Advocate and
Mr. Tanvir Joshi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.69, dated 18.04.2024 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station City Muktsar, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a formal witness to the alleged sale deeds which were transferred in the name of Rajinder Kumar having assigned UID No.B0300882 to the said property, whereas the ownership of the property having UID No.B0300882 is in the name of father of the complainant. He further contends that the petitioner is not a beneficiary to the said transfer of land, which is actually alleged to have been purchased by Rajinder Kumar measuring 4 Marla 1 Sarsahi (124 square yards) from the father of the complainant vide registered sale deed No.1678 dated 25.07.2017, land measuring 3 ½ marla (109 square yards) vide sale deed No.4321 dated 22.02.2018 and land measuring 7 marla 6 ½ sarsahi (233 square yards) vide sale deed No.2020-21/53/1/2096 dated 14.10.2020.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and on instructions from

ASI Balwant Singh submits that it was an agreement to sell between the main accused Rajinder Kumar and father of the complainant namely JagjeetInderpal Singh and thereafter, the above sale deeds were executed by the father of the complainant in favour of Rajinder Kumar, to which the petitioner is a formal witness, however, could not controvert the fact that the petitioner is not a beneficiary of the said transaction.

On a specific query put by this Court, he would fairly informs the Court that custodial interrogation of the petitioner in the matter is not required but certain information is to be gathered and his joining the investigation is must.

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) of Cr.P.C.

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

The petition in the aforesaid terms stands disposed off.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

23.05.2024
Poonam Negi

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