

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

**CRM No. M-32920 OF 2017
DECIDED ON : 13.09.2017**

Avinash Khosla

...Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present : Mr. Bipan Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Paras Talwar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.32 dated 19.02.2017 under Sections 420/467/468/471/120-B IPC registered at Police Station Jamalpur, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a valuator, who had furnished the report for valuation of the property. He further contends that the Bank Manager namely Amrit Lal Garg, who had sanctioned the loan, was in fact the main accused in the matter and has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court by the order dated 12.09.2017 passed in CRM No. M-22959 of 2017.

Learned counsel further states that it was in fact the Bank Manager who himself had to verify the report as well as the property before sanctioning the loan and only upon his

satisfaction, sanction the same.

Heard.

A perusal of the order dated 12.09.2017 passed in CRM No. M-22959 of 2017 by this Court, reveals that the petitioner therein namely Amrit Lal Garg, who was the Bank Manager, had been granted the concession of anticipatory bail as he was stated to have relied upon the valuation report while recommending the loan in the year 2007 and it was later on found that the valuation report referred to different property. Therefore, the case of petitioner herein, who had submitted the valuation report allegedly for a different property, is distinguishable from the role of the Bank manager, who had placed reliance upon the said valuation report for sanctioning the loan.

It also deserves to be noticed here that the petitioner had earlier preferred anticipatory bail in the instant FIR vide CRM No. M-8810 of 2017 which was dismissed as withdrawn by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 27.03.2017. It is observed in the said order that learned counsel for the petitioner having argued the matter at length, prays for withdrawal of the petition. I do not find any reason to take a different view in the matter. Consequently, the instant petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 13, 2017

shalini

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : YES/NO

2. Whether reportable : YES/NO