

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

Sr. No. 103

CRM-M-752-2017

Decided on : 13.01.2017

Parminder Singh

..... Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

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

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr. P. C., the petitioner seeks the concession of the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 124, dated 27.05.2016, registered under Sections 420, 468, 470 and 471 IPC, at Police Station Rama Mandi, Jalandhar.

As per the allegations in the FIR, the complainant's son had got his motor cycle insured from the petitioner. That motor cycle was involved in an accident, as a result of which, it was damaged. When the complainant's son sought reimbursement of such damage from the insurance company, it came to light that the insurance certificate issued by the petitioner was fake and forged.

Learned counsel for the petitioner very fairly admits that the petitioner is an insurance agent for the last several years and in that capacity has insured hundreds of vehicles.

Fortunately, all the vehicles which are insured do not meet with accidents. One such case as the present one has brought out that the

insurance certificate issued by the petitioner was a fake one. Whether only or all the insurance certificates issued by the petitioner to different parties are forged or genuine, is a matter which in my opinion needs to be investigated and for such investigation, according to me, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessary. The menace of issuance of fake insurance certificates has come to my knowledge in other cases as well. Whether the petitioner's involvement is only in the present case or he is part of a larger network, still remains to be established. It would further be necessary for the prosecution to take possession of or recover record from the petitioner's office and then cross-check the same with the insurance company.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the insurance certificate, in question, was never issued by the petitioner nor does it bear his signatures. According to him, only the petitioner's stamp/seal is on the acknowledgment. At this stage, it would not be possible for me to opine on this contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner. Rather this fact would also need to be investigated.

In view of the above, I do not find the present case a fit case for the grant of the concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

13.01.2017
shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No