

**CRM-M-21175-2018**

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

**127**

**CRM-M-21175-2018**

**Date of Decision: 18.05.2018**

**DILBAGH SINGH**

....Petitioner.

Versus

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

...Respondent.

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present: Mr. S.S. Thakur, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.22 dated 27.03.2014 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 420, 465, 468, 471, 506, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station PS Purana Shalla District Gurdaspur as well as the order dated 28.10.2014 (Annexure P-2) whereby he has been declared as proclaimed offender.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations in the FIR, primarily, directed against the co-accused Gopal Singh, who is alleged to have taken ₹ 8 lakh from the complainant for getting him a job in the State Bank of India. The allegations against the petitioner are vague and he is only stated to be a friend of the main accused and would help the complainant in getting a job. The amount was taken by Gopal Singh and the petitioner had issued a cheque in favour of the complainant which

**CRM-M-21175-2018**

is stated to have been dishonoured due to insufficient funds. He further contends that the complainant did not prefer any complaint against the petitioner under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. The co-accused Gopal Singh has been acquitted by the trial Court by the judgment dated 24.01.2018 as the prosecution story had been disbelieved, inter alia, on the ground that the documents including the cheque, which was stated to be issued by the petitioner, had not been produced on record. He also contends that the petitioner was residing at Delhi but he has been served on his address at his native village before the proclamation declaring him as proclaimed offender was issued. The petitioner is willing to surrender before the trial Court and prefer an application for regular bail which may be decided expeditiously.

Consequently, the petition is disposed of with a direction that the petitioner shall surrender before the trial Court within one week and in the event of his doing so, he would be at liberty to prefer an application for regular bail which shall be decided by the trial Court, in accordance with law, expeditiously.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**18.05.2018**

SwarnjitS

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned : | YES/NO |
| Whether reportable :        | YES/NO |