

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

CRM-M -11443 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.12.2016

Jaswinder Singh @ Laddi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Vivek Salathia, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.60 dated 20.02.2016, registered under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC, at Police Station City Khanna, District Ludhiana.

On 04.04.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Petitioner apprehends arrest in a case registered at the instance of Sheela Devi alleging that the petitioner had obtained a sum of Rs.3.60 lacs from her to send her to abroad by cheating her however, neither the amount has been returned nor she has been sent abroad.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the complainant is working as a stamp vendor in Tehsil complex and Judicial Courts Khanna, and that she has already

travelled to a number of countries and has falsely implicated the petitioner.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that as a matter of fact, it is the complainant who has taken a sum of Rs.3 lacs from the petitioner with a false promise to send him abroad and that in this context a complaint has been submitted by the petitioner to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Khanna.

Notice to the Advocate General, Punjab, for 18.5.2016.

Meanwhile, an interim direction is issued that the petitioner will join investigation on 16.4.2016 between 10AM to 4 PM. In case of petitioner doing so, he shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 04.04.2016, the petitioner has repeatedly joined the investigation. The complainant being typing clerk with stamp vendor herself involved in one FIR and 4 other complaints. He further states that there is no proof of entrustment of Rs.3 lacs.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel submits that though the petitioner has joined the investigation but the recovery of Rs. 3 lacs is yet to be effected. However, she fairly admits that complainant is involved in one FIR and four complaints.

The petitioner has repeatedly joined the investigation. In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of

the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 04.04.2016, is made absolute, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

17.12.2016

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
-----------------------------	-----	----

Whether Reportable:	Yes	No
---------------------	-----	----