

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

**CRM No.M-14574 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: July 16, 2018**

Amarjot Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Anil Kumar Lamdharia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Dharambir Bhargav, Advocate
for the complainant-respondent No.2.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.93 dated 14.08.2016 under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sirhind, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR in the present case has been

registered on the basis of application filed by complainant Pritpal Singh. As per the allegations, Vina Sodhi and her husband Sutantar Singh Sodhi approached the complainant and introduced him with car dealer Amarjot Singh Dhanda, present petitioner, at their residence. As per complainant's version, they stated that car make Innova, market price of which is ₹15.50 lakhs, is available for ₹12 lakhs and Vina Sodhi and Sutantar Singh Sodhi obtained a cheque of ₹4 lakhs in the name of Amarjot Singh Dhanda. The remaining amount was paid to Vina Sodhi etc.

The perusal of the record shows that vide order dated 17.07.2017, ₹4 lakhs was ordered to be deposited by the present petitioner, who deposited the same and has been accepted by the complainant.

The petitioner has already joined the investigation. He is not required for custodial interrogation. No useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioner to custody.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find it a fit case, where the petitioner is entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail. Therefore, the present petition is accepted and the order dated 15.05.2017 granting interim bail to the petitioner, is made absolute.

However, nothing stated above, shall constitute my opinion on merits of the case.

July 16, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No