

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

**CRM-M-27378 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 4.9.2015**

Kawalpreet Singh Randhawa @ Kamalpreet Singh Randhawa

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present : Mr. D.S.Gandhi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J. (ORAL)

CRM-28080 of 2015

Applicant seeks permission to place on record Annexure
P-3.

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

CRM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-27378 of 2015

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 81 dated
17.3.2015 under Sections 420/406/120-B IPC registered at Police
Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was only an employee in the company which was running a travel agency. He further submits that main accused, who were owning the travel agency are at large whereas the petitioner, who is just an employee, has been made a soft target by the complainants. He also submits that petitioner served the company which was running the travel agency only for about six months. He concluded by submitting that no receipt was issued by the petitioner to any of the complainants, after receiving alleged amount from them. 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 arguments advanced, 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 it is the own pleaded and argued case on behalf of the petitioner that he was in service of the company which was running a travel agency. This fact has also not been denied that incident took place during the period when the petitioner was serving with the main accused. Further, there is no allegation that any of the complainants was having any previous enmity or motive to falsely implicate the petitioner, besides the main accused are running from law. Even if the petitioner might have not issued the receipt as such, he cannot claim complete innocence.

In view of the above and without commenting anything further on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the rights of

the 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. No case for anticipatory bail has been made out.

Dismissed.

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

4.9.2015
Ak Sharma