

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-11042-2015
Date of decision:07.04.2015

Vinod Kumar Garg and another

...Petitioners

Versus

The State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr.Ashish Aggarwal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr.Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Petitioners seek pre-arrest bail in FIR No.9 dated 23.2.2015 registered under Sections 420/467/468/471/406/506 IPC at Police Station Malout City, District Muktsar.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners never forged any document nor there was any occasion for them to do so. He further submits that after retiring from the existing firm, complainant as well as her two sons namely Dinesh Garg and Deepak Garg applied for a new partnership firm vide Annexure P-12 which shows that they themselves retired from the earlier partnership firm. He also refers to the complaint moved by the petitioners against the complainant at Annexure P-25 and also a civil suit. The civil suit as well as the complaint are pending. He concluded by submitting that a bare perusal of the allegations levelled against the petitioners in the FIR would show that petitioners have been falsely implicated only to pressurise them so as to extract more money from the petitioners.

Having heard the learned senior counsel for the petitioners at considerable length, after careful perusal of the record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the contentions raised, this Court is of the considered opinion that keeping in view the specific and direct allegations against the petitioners, present one has not been found to be a fit case for pre-arrest bail. The allegations levelled against the petitioners are serious. Under these circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioners would be the compulsive necessity of the investigating agency.

Without commenting any further, lest it may prejudice the rights of either of the parties, no case for interference has been made out.

Dismissed.

07.04.2015
mks

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE