

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

CRM-M No.8537 of 2016

Date of Decision:-20.05.2016

Gurcharan Singh @ Seeta.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
assisted by ASI Charanjit Singh.

JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL)

Prayer is under Section 438 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to the petitioner-Gurcharan Singh @ Seeta in case FIR No.125 dated 02.07.2015 for offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 467 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Navi Baradari, Jalandhar.

It is submitted that a false case has been foisted upon the petitioner on the basis of an alleged extrajudicial confession before one Ashok Sareen regarding the involvement of the petitioner in forging educational certificates, certificates of death and birth, driving licence and also verification reports in connivance with two other co-accused namely Harjinder Singh @ Mintu and Kuldeep Kumar.

It is contended that recovery only of a computer has been effected from the premises where raid was conducted and on the report of the FSL report it is found that the same was used for printing forged documents. It is submitted that by itself is not sufficient to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence. The false case has been foisted and as a counter blast to the petitioner having secured anticipatory bail in another Excise Act case.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated in the same.

Learned State Counsel assisted by ASI Charanjit Singh submits that although petitioner has joined investigation pursuant to the directions passed by this Court but he has not co-operated in the investigation. His role in the preparation of forged educational qualification certificates, certificates of death and birth, driving licences and also verification reports etc., has to be unearthed and for the same custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

Counsel for the parties heard.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, it is felt that the custodial interrogation would be required for proper and complete investigation in the case.

Dismissed.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

May 20, 2016
Vinay