

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

CRM No. M-2222 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 09.02.2016

Lalit Kumar

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. J.S. Bedi, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Harpreet Multani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. D.S. Virk, A.A.G., Punjab.
Ms. Anjali Sood, Advocate for
Mr. Rajesh Punj, Advocate for the complainant.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

This order shall dispose of the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C seeking the benefit of regular bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.84 dated 9.9.2015 under sections 420, 406, 120-B, 467, 468, 471 I.P.C and sections 4/5 of Prize Chit And Money Circulation Act, registered at Police Station, Tapa Mandi, District Barnala.

Learned counsel for the parties have been heard.

Process of law was set in motion on the statement of one Sandeep Kumar @ Sunny. In a nutshell allegations are that Vikas Bansal and Satish have collected large sums of money to facilitate investment with a company being run in the name and style of M/s Crown Company. One of the Directors of such company is Jagjit Singh. Money was purportedly invested in the company on the promise of attractive returns. The promised returns on the invested amount having been given for a short period of time, subsequently dried up. Such circumstances led to the filing of the F.I.R and attracting offences under sections 420, 406, 120-B, 467, 468, 471 I.P.C and

sections 4/5 of Prize Chit And Money Circulation Act.

In so far as the present petitioner is concerned, he is sought to be implicated on the basis of a disclosure statement made by Jagjit Singh.

The petitioner has been in custody since 19.9.2015.

Investigation in the present case having been completed qua the present petitioner, even challan has been presented on 9.12.2015. In spite of repeatedly calling upon learned State counsel as also counsel for the complainant to refer to the final challan document and to point out any piece of incriminating evidence against the petitioner, no response was forthcoming. It was merely stated that further investigations may also be necessitated.

In an overview of the matter and without making any observations on merits, present petition is allowed. Petitioner be enlarged on bail subject to satisfaction of C.J.M./Duty Magistrate, Barnala.

Petition disposed of.

09.02.2016

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**