

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

CRM-M No.33046 of 2015

Date of decision: 31st March, 2016

Swaranjit Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurveer Sidhu, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.

Allegations against the petitioner Swaranjit Singh in this second regular bail application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. filed in case FIR No.300 dated 14.12.2013 registered at Police Station Kapurthala City, District Kapurthala under Sections 419/465/467/468/471/472/120-B IPC, are that the petitioner at the relevant time was working as an Agent of tractor agency selling tractors make John Deere. It is alleged that he in connivance with his co-accused/non-applicants including the bank Manager of Union Bank of India, fraudulently facilitated grant of loan for purchase of tractors amounting to ₹76.00 lacs based on forged and fictitious documents of land/collateral securities.

Admittedly, the petitioner was initially allowed regular bail vide separate orders of different dates in the year 2015 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar including in case FIR Nos.479,

480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485 dated 22.12.2014 under Sections 406/420/467/468/471 IPC and FIR No.487 dated 23.12.2014 under Sections 420/467/468 pertaining to Police Station Nakodar, District Jalandhar; FIR Nos.203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208 dated 22.12.2014 under Sections 420/465/467/478 IPC pertaining to Police Station Mehatpur, District Jalandhar; and subsequent thereto had absconded and was declared as PO in the present case on 28.04.2015. In the light of contentions of learned State counsel the petitioner has not only facilitated prolonging of the trial which was put to hold by his intentional absence from the Court till his surrender on 23.01.2015 without any substantive cause but has also misused the concession of bail.

The apprehensions of the State that if allowed bail, the petitioner would again abscond could not be refuted by his counsel together with the number of cases and the apprehension that there is every likelihood that he will tamper with the witnesses and his conduct impels this Court to decline the prayer for grant of bail.

Thus, the present petition stands dismissed. Records be sent back.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

March 31, 2016
rps