

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

CRM-M-42754 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.03.2017

Gurbaksh Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Surinder Gaur, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Tarunvir Vashisht, Advocate for the complainant.

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. 232 dated 04.10.2016, registered under Sections 406, 506 read with Section 34 of IPC, at PS Rajpura City, Patiala

It is contended that the petitioner is engaged in making of jewelry in the shop run by the complainant. On demand of payment of wages, complainant filed a frivolous complaint. The learned counsel refers to Annexure P-2, the enquiry report, wherein no incriminating evidence could be collected against the petitioner. He further states that in pursuance of order dated 01.12.2016, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel submits that the petitioner has offered to pay Rs. 2 lakh to the complainant before the Investigating Officer, whereas the learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is not ready to pay any amount.

The learned counsel for the complainant opposes the bail application.

Heard.

Considering the record i.e. The CD wherein the petitioner has admitted the contents of the same, the claim raised by the complainant and that despite availing repeated opportunities, the petitioner has not been cooperating in the investigation, 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.

20.03.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No