

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

CRM No.M-36978 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: October 11, 2017

Paramjit Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Madan Lal Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Ayush Sarna, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Lokesh Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular/interim bail in case FIR No.6 dated 19.10.2016 under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and Section 4/5 of Prize Chit and Money Circulation Scheme Banning Act 1978, registered at Police Station State Crime, Mohali.

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

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

At the time of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner

prayed that petitioner may be granted interim bail in the present case to

attend the marriage of his son Barinderpal Singh which is fixed for 21.10.2017.

Learned State counsel though not filed the reply, but admitted that the marriage of son of the petitioner is fixed for 21.10.2017. He also brought the fact to the notice of this Court that co-accused, who was granted interim bail for two months, has absconded and has not surrendered even after one year. Learned State counsel contended that in the present case, a scam of ₹18 crores came into light during the enquiry.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case that regular bail petition of the petitioner has already been dismissed by this court and further, in view of the fact that the family was knowing that the petitioner is in custody when the marriage has been fixed and also in view of nature and gravity of the offence, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to interim bail. There is every possibility that present petitioner may abscond.

Furthermore, the marriage card has been placed on record. On 20.10.2017, there is function of 'ladies sangeet and dinner' at Ropar, where presence of the petitioner is not required. Then, the marriage is going to take place at Patiala, whereas the present petitioner is confined in the jail at Ropar. Therefore, in these circumstances, the petitioner cannot be sent in custody to attend the marriage at Patiala from Ropar.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

October 11, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No