

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

203

CRM-M-19880 of 2015

Date of decision: 19.06.2015

Kuldeep Singh @ Babbu

... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Rajiv Vij, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Pathania, DAG, Punjab.

K.Kannan, J.

The petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.52 dated 11.02.2015, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC registered at Police Station Jodhewal, Ludhiana.

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that as per the compliant, he joined with two other persons and committed forgery of transport documents and traveling in a truck alongwith other persons. It is also contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that he is not in anyway connected to the vehicle and that alleged forgery in the name of Rajwant s/o Avtar Singh cannot secure any benefit since he was not in any way connected to Rajwant.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Som Nath, submits that the petitioner's complicity in the offence was based on the statement given by the petitioner's uncle namely Baldev Singh who has

given a statement that apart from the petitioner, two other persons have joined and committed forgery. I asked learned State counsel whether the persons in whose name the alleged forgery purports to have been made viz. Rajwant has been examined and whether there is found any connection between the petitioner and Rajwant. The prosecution was so far proceeded only on the information secured from the DTOs Office. The original entry relating to ownership of the truck was in the name of Deepak and subsequently transferred to the petitioner's uncle, namely Baldev Singh.

The investigation so far conducted has a long way to go. It does not seem like, even the persons who ought to be surely involved in the investigation or investigated have not so far been examined. In the meanwhile, four months have elapsed. Continue incarceration will be grossly inequitable where the investigation is at a tardy pace. The objection by the State is that other persons involved have not been apprehended as yet. The alleged forged documents have been recovered and the witnesses who have given the statements against the petitioner cannot be in any way influenced by the petitioner. It is contended that the petitioner's service is in transport business and he is suffering hardship since the beginning of 2015. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled for bail.

The petitioner is ordered to be released on furnishing bail bonds with two sureties to the satisfaction to the CJM/Duty Magistrate at Ludhiana and will make himself available for interrogation as and

when required and will not do any act which can influence the investigation adversely.

Petition stands disposed of.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

June 19, 2015
sonia g.