

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

CRM-M-40978 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.02.2017

Inderpal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Ramanjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Angel Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition, under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.114 dated 02.09.2016, registered under Sections 420, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC, at Police Station Dugri, Ludhiana.

It is contended that in pursuance of order dated 16.12.2016, the petitioner has joined the investigation. In fact, the petitioner did not receive any amount from the complainant and only the tickets were blocked by the petitioner. As the remaining amount was not paid, therefore, the tickets were not issued to the complainant.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel states that the petitioner is involved in 02 other FIRs of similar nature. She further

states that though the petitioner has joined the investigation, however, the recovery of amount is yet to be effected.

The learned counsel for respondent No.2 submit that the tickets were e-mailed to the petitioner by co-accused, Pawan Kumar who further e-mailed the same to the complainant. He further states that during the investigation and in the statement of co-accused, Pawan Kumar, it has come that at the time of sending the e-mail to the petitioner by him, the ticket numbers were not there. Therefore, the learned counsel submits that the ticket numbers were added and the tickets were e-mailed to him. In fact, the tickets were never prepared or issued in favour of the complainant and others.

Heard.

Considering the fact that the tickets in question, e-mailed by the petitioner to the complainant allegedly received by him from co-accused Pawan Kumar, were never issued by the airlines and the petitioner is involved in 02 other FIRs of similar nature, no case for pre-arrest bail is made out.

Dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

06.02.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes	No
Yes	No