

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

CRM-M No.9036 of 2015

Date of Decision:-17.09.2015

Balwinder Singh @ Giani.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Ms. Rimplejit Kaur, AAG Punjab along with
ASI Gurinder Singh

JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL)

Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.PC to the petitioner-Balwinder Singh @ Giani in case FIR No.192 dated 14.12.2014 for offences punishable under Sections 379, 411 and 420 of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station B. Division, District Amritsar City, Punjab.

As per allegations the allegations the petitioner along with 5/6 other co-accused is alleged to be involved in committing of theft of cars and after preparing forged documents sell them further. On secret information, the car in which they were travelling was intercepted and to of the co-accused Jarmanjeet Singh @ Kala and Lakhwinder Singh @ Khidu were apprehended at the spot, while rest of the accused fled.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner states that he has been falsely implicated due to enmity with the other co-accused. He further states that even the intercepted car belongs to one of the co-accused Jarmanjeet Singh.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Gurwinder Singh states that even the intercepted car allegedly belonging to Jarmanjeet Singh was a stolen car with forged documents. She further states that five cars have been recovered from the apprehended co-accused Jarmanjeet Singh and five cars from Lakhwinder Singh. She further states that apart from the petitioner being named in the FIR his complicity with his gang members has surfaced during investigation and his custodial interrogation is required to have a meaningful investigation. She further states that besides the present case there are two other cases pending against the present petitioner.

Without commenting on the merits of the case, keeping in view the serious nature of the charges, no case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

September 17, 2015
Vinay