

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

CRM-M-41086-2015

Date of decision: 04.12.2015

Sarabjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SABINA, J

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.122 dated 19.09.2015, under Sections 420, 120-B, 323, 343, 354, 354-D and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Anandpur Sahib, District Rupnagar.

Prosecution story, in brief, is that the petitioner had taken ₹12,00,000/- from the complainant-party on the assurance that he would arrange for a plot for them at a cheaper rate. However, the complainant-party was neither delivered any plot nor the amount paid by them to the petitioner was returned. It is further the case of the complainant-party that the petitioner had misbehaved with them and had torn their clothes and had kept them in confinement for seven days and had given beatings to them alongwith his co-accused. Accused had retained the luggage

belonging to the complainant-party and also clicked their objectionable pictures with the help of mobile phones and the same were being used illegally.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has been falsely involved in this case. In fact in the earlier applications moved by the complainant-party, different amounts had been mentioned whereas a different story was given by the complainant-party while lodging the FIR.

In the present case, allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the persecution case, petitioner had taken ₹12,00,000/- from the complainant-party on the assurance that he would get them a plot at a lower rate. However, the complainant-party was neither given a plot nor the amount handed over by them to the petitioner was returned to them. Petitioner and his co-accused confined the complainant-party for seven days and misbehaved with them and had also taken some objectionable pictures of the complainants in their mobile phones. Thus, the petitioner might be required for custodial interrogation.

Dismissed.

December 04, 2015
kapil

(SABINA)
JUDGE