

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No. 107

CRM-M-15384-2017

Decided on : 04.05.2017

Gobind Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Ms.Avinash Mandla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.145, dated 17.08.2013, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 471, 506 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station City Gurdaspur, District Gurdaspur.

The case of the prosecution as borne out from the FIR is that the petitioner alongwith co-accused had demanded and accepted Rs.2 lakhs from the complainant on the pretext of getting the complainant's son recruited in the Army. Co-accused Rena Salaria then handed over to the complainant an appointment letter through which it was projected that the complainant's son had been appointed as an army personnel. On verification, such letter was found to be fake. Thereafter from the aforesaid Rena Salaria and the petitioner return of money was requested to by the complainant which resulted in calls being given to the complainant to the effect that the petitioner and his co-accused would kidnap and kill the complainant's son. The FIR further goes on to state that the petitioner had also defrauded Gurdev Singh son of Harbhajan Singh and Manoj son of Tarlok Singh on similar lines and from both of them had accepted Rs.4.50 lakhs each.

The allegations against the petitioner are serious wherein it is alleged that on at least three occasions the petitioner had duped persons on the pretext of getting them or their kin employment. Whether there are more victims like the complainant needs to be probed. The money allegedly given to the petitioner also needs to be recovered.

It is not disputed that on interim bail having been granted by the Sessions Court at Gurdaspur, the petitioner was directed to join investigation which he did not.

On a query put by the Court, learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions from the petitioner, has admitted that there is another FIR pending against the petitioner on similar allegations as in the present case.

In view of the above, in my opinion, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

Dismissed.

04.05.2017
shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No