

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

CRM-M No.7423 of 2017

Date of decision: 7th November, 2017

Bachan Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal S. Gill, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Allegations against the petitioner Bachan Kaur in this anticipatory bail application filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.167 dated 03.11.2016 registered at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran under Sections 420/467/468/471 IPC, are that in case bearing FIR No.17 dated 18.05.2016 under Section 21 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 pertaining to Police Station Sarai Amanat Khan, Tarn Taran, petitioner Bachan Kaur stood as a surety for accused Gurjant Singh @ Janta and to facilitate acceptance of the bail bonds and surety bonds, filed knowingly forged and fabricated revenue documents by way of jama bandi and subsequently on discovery led to filing of the present case.

Contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner are that there are no serious allegations against the petitioner except that she

submitted revenue documents while furnishing surety bonds of her co-accused which were subsequently found to be forged and that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner.

The bail application is stoutly opposed by learned State counsel Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab on the grounds that the petitioner has tried to play fraud with the Court and by her acts she intentionally wanted to belittle the administration of justice.

Appreciating the submissions, in the light of allegations and since the investigations are at a crucial stage, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much essential together with the fact that the petitioner has not only taken the Court for a ride by intentionally relying upon a forged and fabricated document. That such like acts have attained notoriety, impels this Court to decline the prayer made. More so, it is a well settled proposition of law that the provisions of Section 438 Cr.P.C. are to be sparingly used. Finding no merit in the present petition, the same stands dismissed.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

November 7, 2017

rps

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No