

203-B

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

C.R.M-M No.8288 of 2016

Date of Decision : 08.08.2016

Gurwinder 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 14.03.2016 the following order was passed:-

“Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail to the

petitioner in case FIR No.4 dated 06.01.2016 for offence punishable under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Nehianwala, District Bathinda.

As per the allegations, the car of the complainant was got transferred in the name of the petitioner with forged document with the help of the co-accused.

It is contended that the petitioner himself has affixed his signatures transferring the said vehicle in his name. It is further contended that the co-accused Jagsir singh and Ramesh Kumar have since been granted interim protection.

Notice of motion for 4.4.2016.

To be heard along with CRM-M No.7199 of 2016.

In the event of his arrest, petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the arresting/investigating officer. However, he shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.PC. ”

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 14.03.2016 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