

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

**Crl. Misc. No.M-15117 of 2017**

**Date of Decision: 06.07.2017**

Balbir Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA**

Present: Ms. Gursharan K Mann, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. AA Pathak, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Daman Dhir, Advocate, for  
Mr. APS Mann, Advocate,  
for the complainant.

**RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)**

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.100, dated 05.04.2017, registered under Sections 419/420/467/468/471 IPC at Police Station E-Division, Police District Commissionerate Amritsar.

On 2.5.2017, this Court passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was appointed as a Clerk in Darbar Sahib, Amritsar on 10.06.1985 on the basis of his matriculation certificate. On 25.04.1988, he was designated as Record Keeper and thereafter promoted to the post of Store Keeper (Purchase). On 29.05.2008, the petitioner was suspended for alleged misappropriation of cement bags and thereafter his matriculation certificate was doubted and as per application No.1816 dated 12.11.2008, a report was taken from Punjab School Education Board, Mohali. On the basis of the aforesaid certification, the

complainant is alleged to have moved numerous applications before the SSP and SHO till 08.06.2011. The FIR ultimately came to be registered on 05.04.2017.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. A.P.S. Mann, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the complainant.

List on 06.07.2017.

Till then arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed.”

Today, Mr. Daman Dhir, Advocate appears for Mr. APS Mann and states that he is on travel abroad and the case may be adjourned.

The request for adjournment is not acceptable as it would delay the final outcome of the petition in an anticipatory bail.

Mr. Pathak agrees with Ms. Gursharan Kaur Mann that her client has joined investigation.

Nothing more is required from the petitioner and it appears to be a case where ad interim to be a waste to be warranted on the facts. Consequently, the interim order dated 2.5.2017 is made absolute, subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Petition stands allowed.

**06.07.2017**  
monika

**(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)**  
**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned*  
*Whether reportable*

*Yes/No*  
*Yes/No*