

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

CRM-M-19875-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 24.10.2016

Jatin Pal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Harkeerat Singh, 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 there is nothing on record to connect the present petitioner with the crime, except the disclosure statement of co-accused, Dipneet Kaur, who allegedly stated that a part of the total amount of Rs.1.35 crores, received from the complainant, was paid to the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions, states

ATUL SETHI
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh

that it was on the assurance of the petitioner that the complainant invested the money in the company owned by co-accused Amrit Deep Singh and Dipneet Kaur. The petitioner, in order to mislead the investigation, gave incorrect address. She further states that though the petitioner has joined the investigation, but he is not cooperating.

Learned counsel for co-accused Dipneet Kaur states that the petitioner is a party to the deal and a part of the amount received from the complainant was entrusted to the petitioner. The petitioner has actively participated in the deal.

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 a specific assertion made by learned counsel for co-accused, Dipneet Kaur, to this effect, 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, at this stage.

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