

203-A

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

C.R.M-M No.7199 of 2016

Date of Decision : 08.08.2016

Jagsir Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. J.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Amarjit Kaur Khurana, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. G.B.S. Gill, Advocate
for the complainant.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.4 dated 06.01.2016, registered under Section 420 IPC, at Police Station Nahianwala, District Bathinda.

On 29.02.2016 the following order was passed:-

“Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR

No. 04 dated 6.1.2016 under Section 420 IPC, PS Nehianwala, Bathinda, Distt.Bathinda.

As per allegations, petitioner-Jagsir Singh alongwith coaccused Ramesh Kumar and Gurvinder Singh are alleged to have obtained signatures of complainant on a blank cheque and also snatched his Zen Car and thereby by forging documents the said Car was sold.

It is contended that complainant Rahul Kumar alongwith the petitioner-accused and co-accused Gurvinder are employees of a private Agro Company owned by co-accused Ramesh Kumar. Since the complainant Rahul had embezzled a sum of Rs.8.8 lacs and on such detection co-accused Ramesh had taken certain steps to recover the same, present false case has been foisted upon the petitioner accused being the employee of said Ramesh Kumar. It is further contended that the main accused-Ramesh Kumar has been granted interim protection by this Court.

Notice of motion for 4.4.2016.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer/Trial Court. Petitioner shall appear before the I.O., as and when called upon for investigation and shall also be bound by all the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner
has joined the investigation.

Learned Additional Advocate General on instructions from H.C. Malkiat Singh has stated that the entire case is based on documentary evidence and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. She has further accepted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

In the circumstances, without going into the merits of the case, I do not deem it appropriate to deny the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case. Ordered accordingly.

Resultantly, the interim order dated 29.02.2016 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Petition stands allowed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending criminal miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

August 08, 2016
ashish

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No