

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

CRM-M-19253-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : 24.10.2016

Gurdial Singh Riar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. S.S. Khaira, Advocate,
for Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by HC Jaskaran Singh.

Mr. Manish Prabhakar, Advocate,
for the complainant.

Mr. Hemender Goswami, Advocate,
for co-accused, Dipneet Kaur.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.415 dated 24.11.2015, registered under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, (for short, 'the IPC') at Police Station Civil Lines, Amritsar City.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations are against his son, Amritdeep Singh and daughter-in-law, Dipneet Kaur, that they contacted the complainant and exhorted him to invest in their

company dealing with development work. They allegedly took Rs.1.35 crores from the complainant. The petitioner being father of the co-accused, has been falsely implicated. The petitioner, on coming to know the misdeeds of his son, immediately disowned him. The house in question was purchased by the petitioner much prior to the present complaint. The petitioner has joined the investigation in pursuance of the orders passed by this Court.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the petitioner disowned his son after the registration of the present FIR, only to create a defense in his favour. The petitioner is residing in the same house.

Heard.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner and his co-accused have usurped a huge amount of Rs.1.35 crores from the complainant, as admitted by learned counsel for co-accused, Dipneet Kaur and that not even a single penny has been returned to the complainant so far, this Court feels that it is a fit case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

In view of the above, no case for grant of bail is made out.

Dismissed.

However, nothing noticed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court, on the merits of the case.

24.10.2016
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No

ATUL SETHI
2016.11.03 17:38
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh