

Crl. Misc. No.M-19858 of 2015

[1]

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

**Crl. Misc. No.M-19858 of 2015
Date of decision:16.06.2015**

Mangal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

The petitioner has prayed for grant of pre-arrest bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, in a case registered vide FIR No.134 dated 07.06.2014, under Sections 420, 170 and 120B IPC at Police Station Guruharsahai, District Ferozepur.

The allegation against the petitioner is that he is also a member of the gang who has been duping/cheating the persons like the complainant in the name of doubling their amount and as many as 8 FIRs have already been registered against the petitioner, which are reproduced as under:-

- “1. FIR No.53 dated 07.07.2001, P.S. Guruhar Sahai, under Sections 420, 120B IPC.
2. FIR No.22 dated 05.04.2002, P.S. Mamdot, under Section 420 IPC.
3. FIR No.42 dated 27.03.2003, P.S. City Fazilka, under Section 420 IPC.

Crl. Misc. No.M-19858 of 2015

[2]

4. FIR No.376 dated 30.10.2008, P.S. City Kapurthala, under Sections 420, 406 IPC.
5. FIR No.181 dated 22.11.2009, P.S. Makhu, under Sections 420, 120B IPC.
6. FIR No.35 dated 11.03.2010, P.S. Guruhar Sahai, under Sections 420, 120B IPC.
7. FIR No.142 dated 12.06.2014, P.S. Guruhar Sahai, under Sections 15/18/21/22/61 of NDPS Act and 489-A, 489-B, 489-C of IPC.
8. FIR No.25 dated 16.02.2014, P.S. Cantt. Ferozepur, under Sections 21 of NDPS Act and 25 of Arms Act.”

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been acquitted in FIR No.181 dated 22.11.2009, however, a perusal of the judgment itself shows that it was also a case of cheating by inducing the complainant to double his currency notes.

Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances emerging out from the available record, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail not only because of the allegations contained in the present FIR but also on account of his past act and conduct much-less his antecedents.

Consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed being denuded of any merit.

June 16, 2015
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge