

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

Crl. Misc. No.M-37801 of 2015

Date of Decision: 04.11.2015

Jagbir Singh @ Rajinder Singh @ RinkaPetitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ? (Yes/No)**
- 2. To be referred to reporters or not ? (Yes/No)**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ? (Yes/No)**

Present:- Mr. M.S. Basra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.42 dated 13.04.2015 registered under Sections 302/34/420/120-B IPC at Police Station Civil Lines Batala, District Gurdaspur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially the FIR was registered under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC and the offence under Section 302 IPC was added later on due to pressure. He further submits that the incident occurred in *Malaysia* and no offence is made out against the petitioner. Learned counsel also submits that the passport of the petitioner has expired on 13.07.2008 and the petitioner was not even present in *Malaysia* at the time of occurrence. Nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and he is ready to join the investigation.

Heard the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner and have also perused the allegations levelled in the FIR.

As per allegations in the FIR, an amount of ₹ 15 lacs was settled for sending the husband of the complainant to *Malaysia* and thereafter to *America*. Some of the amount was received in India and the remaining amount was to be received after reaching *America* by the persons of the petitioner's group. The petitioner was in constant touch of the persons in *Malaysia* and there was a talk of getting amount on reaching at different places. Petitioner is one of the member of the group, who are involved in such like business. Specific allegations are there against the petitioner and other accused.

Keeping in view the specific allegations and role of the petitioner, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to him as his custodial interrogation is required. Not only the involvement of the present petitioner is there but a group of persons are involved.

Hence, the petition, being devoid of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

04.11.2015
gurpreet

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE