

201

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

**CRM-M-42720-2017
Date of Decision: 27.11.2017**

Kamaljeet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Ms. Savita Bhandari, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab,
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. R.S. Athwal, Advocate,
for respondent No.2/complainant.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA J. (ORAL)

Seen the affidavits sent up by the Senior Superintendent of Police, Jalandhar Rural and Deputy Commissioner of Police-I, Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar along with the annexure appended thereto.

[2]. It transpires that the phone call relied upon by the concerned Police Officers was between the complainant and wife of the petitioner. It was not the same phone call which had been heard by this Court in dismissing the petitioner's previous application being **CRM-M-36477-2017**. A transcript of the said phone call between the complainant and the present petitioner directly certainly indicates that the petitioner had at some point of time taken custody of the complainant's participate and other certificates. As such, there is no reason to hold at this stage that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the interest of investigation, or that the

transaction between the parties related only to inflated price of land allegedly sold to the complainant and had nothing to do with the allegation that the petitioner had accepted a huge sum of money for sending the complainant abroad.

[3]. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the aforesaid phone call cannot be treated as authentic since it is not certified. But at the stage of investigation however, it is held that formal certification of the material collected during investigation is not necessarily warranted. The appropriate stage for the same will arrive only if such material is finally relied upon after completion of investigation.

[4]. Consequently, the Court finds no reason to deviate from its previous order rejecting the petitioner's application for anticipatory bail.

[5]. Dismissed.

27.11.2017

Bhumika

**(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

2. Whether reportable: Yes/No