

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

CRM No.M-21808 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 10, 2018

Satpal Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Damanjit Sandhu, Advocate for
Mr.P.S.Guliani, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Pawan Sharda, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.101 dated 08.11.2017 under Sections 409, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC and Section 13(1) (c) of Prevention of Corruption Act, registered at Police Station Sadar, Malout.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

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

From the record, I find that as per FIR, the present petitioner was posted as Sub-Post Master, Ramnagar Sounder, Faridkot and he

committed a fraud of ₹1,51,800/-. As per the allegations, Sandeep Kaur

deposited an amount of ₹30,000/- in her account on 11.05.2017. The amount was paid by her to present petitioner, who after receiving the amount, made an entry of deposit in the pass book but did not account for this amount in the government account and used the same for his personal affairs. Then complainant visited post office on 16.09.2017 for withdrawal of ₹11,000/-. The present petitioner paid an amount of ₹11,000/- to her and made entry of withdrawal in the passbook but at that time, there were only ₹9,000/- in account of Sandeep Kaur. The investigation is still going on and he defrauded many persons like this. During enquiry, big frauds came to light.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the serious allegations against the present petitioner regarding embezzlement as well as forgery of documents etc., I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail. The petitioner is required for custodial interrogation. The recoveries are still to be effected.

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

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

July 10, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No