

**CRM-M-40394-2016 and
CRM-M-40918-2016**

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

Date of Decision:07.03.2017

1. CRM-M-40394-2016

Sanmeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

AND

2. CRM-M-40918-2016

Sarwan Kumar Sharma

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-40394-2016.

Mr. P.B.S.Goraya, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-40918-2016.

Mr. Deep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rahul Rampal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

This order shall dispose of CRM-M-40394-2016, filed by
petitioner-Sanmeet Singh and CRM-M-40918-2016, filed by petitioner-
Sarwan Kumar Sharma under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal

**CRM-M-40394-2016 and
CRM-M-40918-2016**

12.09.2016, registered at Police Station Cantonment, District Amritsar City, under Sections 419, 420, 466, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

Notice of motion was issued in these petitions. Learned State counsel put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and the complainant also appeared through her counsel. They contested these petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners; learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for complainant and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that as per the allegations, complainant, who is an NRI, deposited Rs.85 lakhs in her account with HFFC Bank. However, the accused by forging signatures of the complainant invested money in bonds etc. without her consent.

Learned counsel for the petitioners stated that the complainant signs in different ways and there are different signatures of the complainant on Pan-card, account opening form and passport etc.

However, learned State counsel has brought into notice of this Court that signatures on the bank papers have been got compared with the signatures of the complainant on the passport and these are found to be different.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; without discussing the facts of the case in minute details; without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and in view of the nature

**CRM-M-40394-2016 and
CRM-M-40918-2016**

and gravity of the offence, I find that the petitioners are required for custodial interrogation. Therefore, no ground is made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Dismissed.

07.03.2017
parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

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