

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

CRM-M-18697-2015
Date of decision:2.6.2015

Jagtar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

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.Keshav Partap Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No.80 dated 27.4.2015 registered under Sections 406, 419, 420 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner places reliance on an order dated 20.5.2015 passed by this Court in CRM-M-17129-2015 (Manjit Singh v. State of Punjab), whereby co-accused of the petitioner was granted concession of interim anticipatory bail, issuing notice to Advocate General, Punjab, for 16.7.2015. He further submits that the only additional role attributed to the petitioner was that he put his signatures on the back side of the cheque, which would mean that petitioner had only put his signatures for the purpose of identifying the person who signed the cheque. He had no role to play. He prays for allowing the present petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner 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 in the given fact situation of the present case, petitioner has not been found entitled for concession of anticipatory bail, it is so said because case of the petitioner is clearly distinguishable from his co-accused namely Manjit Singh. Signatures put by the petitioner on the back side of the cheque would not be only a formality or it cannot be treated to be superfluous. In fact, signatures of the petitioner on the back side of the cheque enabled his other accused for withdrawing the huge amount from the bank account of the co-accused namely Jaswinder Kaur. It also goes without saying that petitioner would not put his signatures without any consideration.

In view of the above and without commenting anything further on the merits in this regard, at this stage, lest it should prejudice the rights of the parties, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be a compulsive necessity of the investigating agency so as to conduct an effective investigation. In this view of the matter, no case for anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

2.6.2015
mks

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE