

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

**CRM-M-20992 of 2015
Date of Decision: 6.7.2015**

Parveen Sharma

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present : Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J. (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 102 dated 29.4.2015, under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Shimlapuri, District Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that neither the petitioner was employed in the bank, nor he had any connection with the offence in question. He further submits that in fact, there was no occasion for the petitioner to indulge in the commission of offence alleged against him. He also submits that there are no specific allegations against the petitioner. He concluded by submitting that allegations are general in nature, because of which the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail. 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 in the given fact situation of the present case, petitioner has not been found entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail. It is so said, because allegations against the petitioner are not only direct and specific, but the same are serious as well. From the reading of the FIR, it seems that the petitioner is the main accused. Further, an identical petition bearing CRM No. 18919 of 2015 filed on behalf of Rajinder Singh-co accused of the present petitioner, was also dismissed by this Court vide order dated 3.6.2015.

In view of the above and without commenting anything further on the merits of the case, at this stage, lest it should prejudice the rights of either of the parties, present one is a case wherein custodial interrogation of the petitioner is the compulsive necessity of the investigating agency, so as to carry out an effective investigation. No case for anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

6.7.2015
Ak Sharma