

**CRM No.21300 of 2016 and
CRM-M No.21344 of 2016**

-1-

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

**CRM No.21300 of 2016 and
CRM-M No.21344 of 2016
Date of Decision.09.08.2016**

Sudip Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjiv Patiyal, Advocate
for the complainant.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The petitioner moved the application in CRM No.21300 of 2016 for extension of the interim bail granted by this Court in respect of FIR No.82 dated 18.05.2016 under Sections 408/120-B IPC on the ground that later on during investigation, police has added Sections 420, 465, 467 and 471 IPC for alleged commission of offences.

Learned State counsel on instructions from Yashpal Singh, ASI and Mr. Sanjiv Patiyal, learned counsel appearing for the complainant submits that the petitioner had indulged into, prima facie, commission of forgery of the bills whereas the goods lost were of Standing Corporation Limited, Barnala and thus, there is loss not only in terms of money but

actually forgery. On the basis of the complaint, the petitioner was called in

the police station and a compromise arrived at wherein the petitioner had agreed to discharge the liability. It is not a case of civil offence and specimen of signatures has to be obtained regarding the receipt of the alleged bills i.e. of the consignee. In fact, police did not recover the goods, which had been consigned away by the petitioner.

In view of the aforementioned, I do not deem it appropriate to extend the interim bail with regard to earlier offence *viz-a-viz* the aforementioned alleged offences added later on. The application bearing CRM No.21300 of 2016 as well as the main petition bearing No.CRM-M No.21344 of 2016 are dismissed.

Needless to state that nothing observed in this order shall come in the way of defence of the petitioner while deciding the criminal trial.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

August 09, 2016
Pankaj*