

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

CRM No.M-11631 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.04.2017

Narinder Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Simranjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab

Mr. Raj K. Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By way of petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought regular bail in FIR No.120, dated 06.7.2016, registered under Sections 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (for the 'the IPC'), at Police Station Division 4, Police Commissionerate, District Ludhiana.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The only role attributed to the petitioner is that he permitted the use of his account for facilitation of the amount of Rs.9,85,000/-, which was allegedly received from co-accused, Jatinder Yogi. However, the same was done in a good

faith. He is not the beneficiary of the transaction. He is in custody since 07.07.2016.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel submits that the petitioner presented the cheque in question against his own account after forging the cheque books in connivance with Bank Manager, namely, Paramjit Singh. The amount in question was credited in the account of the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

The petitioner in connivance with co-accused, Paramjit Singh allegedly forged and presented the cheque against his account. The co-accused allegedly got the said cheque cleared and accordingly the amount in question was credited in the account of the petitioner. Considering the nature of the offence and the specific allegations made against the petitioner, this Court feels that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the truth.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be taken to be an opinion on merits of the case.

20.04.2017

ashok

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes / No

Whether reportable:

Yes / No