



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

104

CRM-M-5218-2025

Date of decision: January 30th, 2025

Sunder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Som Nath Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.604 dated 31.12.2024 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station City, Palwal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that totally false and fabricated allegations have been levelled against the petitioner in the present FIR. In the initial conveyance deed No.10109 dated 28.12.2023, the name of the petitioner was not mentioned, either as a seller or buyer or even as a witness and, therefore, it was evident that neither he nor his family were in any manner connected with the alleged offences or even with the co-accused. A prayer has been made that in the circumstances, since the petitioner is ready to join investigation, his prayer may be accepted and he be extended the concession of bail.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

4. *Prima facie*, there are serious and specific allegations levelled against the petitioner, who along with his co-accused Lalit and

others, orchestrated the execution of a fake conveyance deed for a custodian property belonging to the Government in favor of a fictitious person, Bandhan Bir Singh. Further, using the forged conveyance deed, the petitioner along with the co-accused subsequently executed a sale deed in favor of Madhu Bala, wife of co-accused Lalit. Madhu Bala later sold the property to the complainant for ₹50 lakh. Pertinently the mobile number mentioned in the stamp paper of the conveyance deed is that of the petitioner, *prima facie* linking him directly to the fraudulent transaction. A total of ₹46,90,000/- was allegedly transferred from the account of Madhu Bala into the accounts of the petitioner and the family members, suggesting financial gains from the fraud. There are also serious allegations against the petitioner of having forged the seal of the Tehsildar, which further indicates his *prima facie* involvement in the offence.

5. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

7. 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.

January 30th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No