

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

**CRM-M-18927 of 2015**

**Date of Decision: 3.6.2015**

Paramjeet Singh @ Prabhjeet Singh @ Pamma

--Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab

--Respondent.

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK**

Present : Mr. Vipul Dharmani, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J. (ORAL)**

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 165 dated 1.9.2011 registered under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, at Police Station Tanda, District Hoshiarpur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has no role to play in the present case. He further submits that co-accused of the present petitioner namely Paramjit Singh, Lambardar, was the attesting witness of the power of attorney on the basis of which the land of Smt. Savitri Devi, who was living in England, was sought to be sold. No specific allegation has been attributed to the petitioner. He also submits that dismissal of pre-arrest bail application of Paramjit Singh-co accused of the petitioner by this Court, does not disentitle the petitioner from the concession of pre-arrest bail. He next contended that although the FIR is dated 1.9.2011, yet since the petitioner was never informed by the investigating agency, he was not aware about the proceedings initiated against him under Section 82 Cr.P.C. He concluded by submitting that the moment petitioner came to know about initiation of proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C., he approached the learned court of Sessions, seeking

anticipatory bail, which was dismissed. He prays for allowing the present petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, 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 since neither the petitioner has joined the investigation nor he ever cooperated with the investigating agency for all these about 4 years, he has not been found entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail. It is so said, because the petitioner approached the learned court of Sessions only after initiation of proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. against him. Challan has already been presented against the co-accused of the petitioner but the same could not be presented against the petitioner because he never cooperated with the investing agency. Further, it is also a matter of record that this Court, vide its order dated 26.9.2011 passed in CRM-M-29319 of 2011 (Paramjit Singh Vs. State of Punjab), dismissed the petition seeking anticipatory bail by the co-accused of the petitioner.

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

Dismissed.

**(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)**  
**JUDGE**

3.6.2015  
AK Sharma