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

CRM No.M-36466 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 14.12.2015

Satpal Singla and ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN**

Present: Mr. Sunil Garg, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Mehardeep Singh, DAG, Punjab
assisted by SI Harjinder Singh.

Mr. A. P. S. Deol, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

****

**<u>JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)</u>**

By way of petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in case FIR No.255, dated 07.09.2015, registered under Sections 420, 406, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (for the 'the IPC') and Section 4, 5 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2012, at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

The learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case and the petitioners are not named in the FIR. It is contended that being the relatives of the co-accused Ish Kumar, they are involved in the present case.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel as well as the learned counsel for the complainant submit that in connivance with the other co-accused the petitioners had allured people to invest their money to get the higher interest rate @ 4% on their investments. Neither the amount of interest was paid nor the money returned. The learned State counsel submits that there are total 19 accused including the petitioners. He states that the petitioners are involved in number of complaints. He submits that the complainant-Baldev Singh Ahluwalia has specifically stated that Rs.1,7,94,780/- was paid to the petitioner-Satpal Singh at his residence. The learned counsel for the complainant refers to transaction where the amount, collected by the accused i.e.Ish Kumar, was transferred in the account of the petitioners.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

Considering the fact that the petitioner along with other co-accused have committed fraud with the complainant and some other persons by making fraud with them on the name of good return by investing their money in company running on the name and style of Crown Company; the number of complaints have been received against the petitioner and the specific allegations are made against the petitioners, no case for bail is made out at this stage.

Dismissed.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be taken to be an opinion on merits of the case.

14.12.2015 **(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)**
*ashok* **JUDGE**