

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

***CRM No.M-9088 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 31.03.2016***

Jagrup Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. B.S. Sewak, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. D.S. Virk, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the complainant.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.21 dated 26.02.2016, under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

Perusal of the FIR would reveal that the same was registered on the complaint of a Panch of the village concerned and the allegations against the present petitioner who was Sarpanch is that he has been appending the signatures of the Panch/complainant on resolutions as and when the coram was not complete and on the basis of such resolutions, grants have been utilized.

This Court has perused the proceedings of the Panchayat

dated 10.03.2014 in which there were four different resolutions taken up. It is such proceedings in which the signatures of the complainant are stated to have been forged.

Learned State counsel has informed that the FIR has been registered after obtaining the opinion of the handwriting expert and as per which the signatures on the proceedings dated 10.03.2014 of Sadhu Singh Panch and Ramji Singh Panch have been forged. The proceedings at Annexure P-1 further reveal that apart from substantial payments having been released purportedly towards construction material even a cheque of Rs.37,000/- was issued in the name of Sarpanch Jagrup Singh, accused himself for making certain expenditure.

The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature with regard to forgery and misappropriation of grants and money which is essentially meant for the welfare of the village and its residents.

Under such circumstances, this Court does not find any infirmity in the order dated 05.03.2016 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda declining the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Petition is dismissed.

31.03.2016

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**