

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

CRM No.M-26478 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 02, 2018

Inderpal Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Jatinderpal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Karanbir Singh, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.23 dated 05.12.2016 under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and Sections 7, 13(1) (c) (d) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Bathinda, District Bathinda.

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 this is second anticipatory bail petition. The first bail petition, after arguing for some time, was got

dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 07.02.2017. As per the allegations

in the FIR, the present petitioner was posted as Patwari and he, in connivance with other co-accused, gave wrong damage report. He has stated that Narma (cotton) crop has been damaged due to pests whereas paddy crop was sown in that land and thus, the petitioner has caused financial loss to the tune of ₹3,70,948/-.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I do not find it a fit case, where petitioner is entitled for grant of anticipatory bail. Rather, the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

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

July 02, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No