

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-43128 of 2015 (O&M)

.....

Date of decision:27.2.2016

Kuldeep Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

....

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh**

.....

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

Mr. P.S. Grewal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab  
for the respondent-State.

.....

**Inderjit Singh, J.**

The petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.95 dated 9.6.2015 registered for the offences under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC and Section 12 of Passports Act, 1967 at Police Station Division No.7 Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Mr. P.S. Grewal, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

Deputy Advocate General, Punjab appearing for the respondent-State and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that this is second bail petition filed by petitioner-Kuldeep Singh. Earlier bail petition filed by him has already been dismissed on merit by this Court vide order dated 16.9.2015. As per the allegations against the present petitioner six passports have been recovered from him. The police record also shows that the statements of so many witnesses have been recorded during the investigation in which those persons have stated regarding giving of money and passports to the accused including the petitioner. It has also been mentioned in the earlier order passed by this Court that as no witness has been recorded in this case and the case is at preliminary stage, there is every likelihood of tampering with the evidence. It has been brought to my notice that no witness has been recorded so far as the proceedings for declaring two of the accused as proclaimed offenders were going on, but now the case has been fixed for prosecution evidence. As no witness has been examined so far and there is chance of tampering with the evidence and in view of the nature and gravity of the offences and further that there is no changed circumstances for grant of bail, this petition is liable to be dismissed.

Therefore, finding no merit in this petition, the same is dismissed.

However, the prosecution is directed to produce private witnesses in the trial Court preferably within four months. The Investigating Officer of this case is directed to attend the trial Court on each and every

date till these private witnesses are examined.

February 27, 2016.

**(Inderjit Singh)**  
**Judge**

\*hsp\*