

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

**CRM-M No.3607 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.02.2016**

Varinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S.Randhawa, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State assisted by A.S.I. Malwinder Singh.

Mr. N.S.Shekhawat, Advocate for the complainant.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. to the petitioner/accused-Varinder Singh in case FIR No.173 dated 14.12.2015, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, registered with Police Station B-Division, Amritsar (**Annexure P-1**).

Petitioner is stated to be Manager of complainant Finance Company allegedly involved in release of loans against fake invoices of vehicles and without verification of the loanees.

It is contended that the alleged offences against the present petitioner of cheating and forgery etc. are based on documents, which are already in the custody of the complainant Company, therefore, no case for custodial interrogation of the petitioner is made out. In support, learned Counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the judgment passed by this Court bearing **CRM-M No.760 of 2012, decided on 01.02.2012 titled as 'Kesho Ram Gupta Vs. State of Punjab'**.

Learned State Counsel, assisted by ASI Malwinder Singh and learned Counsel for the complainant, point out that the petitioner has been found to be involved in the sanctioning of various loans to various persons on the basis of forged and fabricated documents. It has come to light that the petitioner is also involved in nine other such loan transactions based on forged and fabricated documents.

After hearing learned Counsel for the parties, it is apparent that for unearthing the role of the petitioner in more cases and also the extent of his involvement in sanctioning and releasing huge amounts based on forged documents, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be required for an effective and meaningful investigation. The facts of the cited judgment are clearly distinguishable from the present case.

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

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

February 11, 2016

Gagan

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**