

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

(i) CRM No.M-26859 of 2017 (O&M)

Gaurav Lamba

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

(ii) CRM No.M-28229 of 2017 (O&M)

Mohd. Shahid

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Date of Decision: September 14, 2017

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.G.S.Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.B.S.Virk, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Naresh Kumar, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Both the above-mentioned cases are taken up together as the same have arisen from same FIR.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0368 dated 06.05.2017 under Sections 120-B, 149, 406, 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC, registered at Police

Station Chandnibagh, District Panipat.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that complainant Shivali was married with petitioner Gaurav Lamba. As per the allegations in the FIR, the cheques signed by Shivali and some other documents, on which her signatures were taken by Gaurav Lamba, have been misused and handed over to other persons. As per the case of the complainant, on the basis of those documents, petitioner Mohd. Shahid also filed the complaint and other complainant also filed cases regarding some agreement to sell and under Sections 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

In view of the above facts, I find that petitioners are required for investigation and custodial interrogation as the cheques and document are to be recovered from them.

Without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I do not find it a fit case where petitioners are entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in both the petitions, the same are dismissed.

September 14, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No