

215

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

CRM-M No.14649 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 26.04.2018

Kuldeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Vishal Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hittan Nehra, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Vishal Garg, Advocate,
for the complainant.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

CRM-15054-2018

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the application is allowed and the accompanying document is taken on record, subject to just exception.

CRM-M No.14649 of 2018 (O&M)

1. Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.195 dated 01.11.2017, registered under Sections 420, 406, 34 IPC at Police Station Sadar, Raikot, District Ludhiana.

2. At one point of time, there was a compromise between the parties to which complainant herself was a signatory. As per the said compromise, three cheques were given by Gaurav Sood in favour of Kuldeep Singh. The said cheques on presentation were dishonoured. Two complaints in respect of two cheques are statedly pending at the instance of Kuldeep Singh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that after investigation, challan has already been submitted.

4. Petitioner is in custody since 29.01.2018.

5. By referring to **Sanjay Chandra and Vinod Goenka vs Central Bureau of Investigation, 2011(4) RCR (Criminal) 898, Babba vs State of Maharashtra, (2005) 11 SCC 569** and **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre vs State of Maharashtra, 2011(1) RCR (Criminal) 126**, learned counsel submitted that even in case of economic offences, after filing of challan, prayer for regular bail can be considered.

6. Learned State counsel duly assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, however opposed the prayer on the ground that huge amount is involved in the present case and the story as projected by learned counsel for the petitioner is not true.

7. Since challan has already been presented and the

offence is triable by Magistrate, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail.

8. In view of above, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

26.04.2018
jyoti

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No