

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

CRM No.M-39 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.01.2016

Amritdeep Singh Riar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present:- Ms. Anupam Bhanot, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Parbhakar, Advocate for the complainant.

....

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J.

Petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.57 dated 28.10.2015, under Section 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Tarsikka, District Amritsar.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

Complainant in the present case is Manjit Singh. The allegations against the petitioner as also his wife are in relation to having induced the complainant to pay a sum of Rs.46 lacs for delivery of a flat in a colony at Greater Noida, New Delhi NCR. As per allegations, the petitioner had portrayed to be the President of Earth Infrastructure Link i.e. a company which was building the colony in question. Even an agreement to sell was stated to have been entered into and as per such agreement, sale deed in respect to the flat was to be executed in the year 2014. Possession of the flat having not been delivered, the petitioner is stated to have issued a cheque for the amount in question i.e. Rs.46 lacs dated 07.08.2014 and drawn on Mahindra Kotak Bank. The cheque upon presentation is stated to have been dishonoured.

The allegations against the petitioner are specific and serious in nature.

At this stage, counsel appearing for the complainant has also produced before the Court a copy of another FIR bearing No.415 dated 24.11.2015, under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Amritsar in which the complainant is one Vishal Singh and in which also the present petitioner, namely, Amritdeep Singh Riar is the accused and the allegations are identical. A copy of such FIR was even furnished to the counsel for the petitioner who has not been able to rebut the factual aspect as regards another complaint on identical allegations having been made.

Apparently, the petitioner is a habitual offender. It would be a case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be warranted to elicit the truth.

No merit.

Dismissed.

12.01.2016

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**