

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-23711 of 2018

Date of decision:27.7.2018

Mehar Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. G.P.S. Ball, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.1 dated 1.1.2015 registered for the offences under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC and Section 12(1)(d) read with Section 12(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Bathinda, District Bathinda.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Mr. Pawan Sharda, learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and contested this petition.

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

[2]

From the record, I find that earlier bail petition of the petitioner had been dismissed on merit by this Court vide order dated 23.4.2015. In that order the Court has held that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and no case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail.

As the first petition has been dismissed on merit, the petitioner has not shown any cogent changed circumstances for accepting the second petition for grant of anticipatory bail. The mere fact that the petitioner was not arrested after the dismissal of the first anticipatory bail petition cannot be held as changed circumstances.

The learned State counsel has brought it to my notice that earlier when the bail to the co-accused had been granted the amount of fraud etc. was only about ₹1 lakh, but now during the period the investigation has been made the forgery in documents of about 90,000 vehicles had been made and about ₹8 crores loss has been caused to the State exchequer by the accused.

A perusal of the record shows that there are serious allegations against the present petitioner and forged the documents etc.

Keeping in view above facts, I find that no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out and this petition is dismissed.

July 27, 2018.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

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