

CRM-M-8234-2017

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

**CRM-M-8234-2017 (O & M)
Date of Decision: 10.03.2017**

Jashandeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. A.G.S.Dhillon, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

CRM-8256-2017

Allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-8234-2017

Petitioner-Jashandeep Singh has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.206 dated 14.08.2014, registered at Police Station Kotwali Faridkot, under Sections 409 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR, in the present case, has been registered on the basis of a letter written by the Superintendent, Central Jail, Faridkot to the SSP Faridkot. As per the allegations, the present petitioner was posted as Assistant Superintendent in the Central

CRM-M-8234-2017

Jail, Faridkot and was the incharge of welfare officer of the jail w.e.f. August, 2013 to February, 2014. But his duty was changed because his work was not satisfactory and Karnail Singh Khosa, Assistant Superintendent was posted at his place, who had taken the charge of welfare officer w.e.f. 05.03.2014. However, the present petitioner had not given the charge of welfare cash of ₹20 lacs in spite of saying time and again and it looks that the present petitioner has done some big embezzlement.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has brought into notice of this Court that a letter written to the Additional Director General of Police (Jails), Punjab, Chandigarh in which it is mentioned that the petitioner has given the details of amount upto ₹2023,738 and still vouchers of ₹3,72,230/- are yet to be given by the petitioner.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of nature and gravity of the offence and in view of the fact that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

10.03.2017

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No