

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32604-2016

Date of decision: February 09, 2017.

Karam Singh

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Punjab

... **Respondent**

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI**

Present: Shri P.K. Kukreja, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri Abhishek Chautala, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral):

Heard learned Counsel for the rival parties.

The petitioner seeks the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.130 dated 17.6.2016, under Sections 342, 384, 420, 506 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Gobindgarh Mandi, District Fatehgarh Sahib on the ground of false implication.

Following are the allegations against the petitioner which I quote from para 5 of the impugned order:-

“On 03.06.2016 complainant is stated to have withdrawn a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- from his account. On 07.06.2016 he was on his way to pay a sum of Rs.38,000/- to Jaswant Singh son of Sohan Singh. On that day he could not meet Jaswant Singh and was coming back home. On the way, he received a call from mobile No.09876175078 from one Bhinder Kaur who informed him that in case he wanted the repayment of the amount of Rs.60,000/- which is owned from Jasbir Kaur, he should come to her at Hargobind Colony Ward No.2, Kotla Road, Mandi Gobindgarh. At about 02:30 PM, he reached there. After about 10-15 minutes, three persons came there one of them kept standing outside while the other two came inside. One of those persons was Karam Singh Press Reporter R/o

Village Maira, Bassi Pathana. Karam Singh and the another unidentified persons pressurized the complainant to pose with Bhinder Kaur. In the process, they succeeded in getting pictures of complainant with Bhinder Kaur in a compromising posture. Thereafter, they threatened to make those pictures public in case he refused to pay them Rs.2,00,000/- within one hour. In the process Bhinder Kaur, Karam Singh and the unidentified persons also took away sum of Rs.38,000/- along with some other documents which he was carrying in the dicki of his scooter. After he had left the place, he was again called by Bhinder Kaur and Karam Singh to press upon him to pay the sum of Rs.2,00,000/- or else they would make his photographs public.”

The contention of Learned Counsel for the petitioner that the allegations are false, cannot be accepted at this stage. Indeed these allegations against the petitioner are far serious. Such offences are on the increase in ugly greed for money. The question of extending the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner does not arise. In the given facts and circumstances of the case, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessitated in order to make recovery of the photographs and the camera used in the offence and the money, as also other documents, as alleged in the complaint by the complainant which were taken away from the dicky of the scooter.

Hence rejected.

[A.B. Chaudhari]
Judge

February 09, 2017.
kadyan

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No