

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-35732-2017(O&M)

Date of Decision: 15.02.2018

Pipal Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. M.S. Sodhi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Jaspreet Kaur, A.A.G., Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J (Oral)

Petitioner seeks the benefit of anticipatory bail in case F.I.R.
No.124 dated 6.11.2015 under sections 420, 120-B I.P.C, registered at
Police Station, Mamdot, District Ferozepur.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

FIR came to be registered on the complaint of Balbir Singh son
of Kundan Singh with the allegations that the petitioner in connivance with
one Puran Singh has formed a company by the name of Good Faith and has
taken a sum of Rs.40 lacs from the complainant on the pretext that attractive
returns would be furnished. Complainant has alleged that Rs.40 lacs was
entrusted to the accused party in the year 2013 and upon which interest @
3% per month was paid for about 3 months but thereafter interest has not
been paid and even the principal amount has been misappropriated. Further
allegations are that towards return of principal amount certain cheques were
issued but even the same upon presentation have bounced. Complainant has
further asserted that some of the cheques issued by the accused party are
also in his possession.

Learned State counsel upon instructions from ASI Balwinder Singh apprises the Court that during the course of investigation, complainant has produced cheques of different amounts and some of which have been signed by the co-accused Puran Singh and some have been signed by present petitioner namely Pipal Singh.

On a previous date of hearing i.e. 1.11.2017 counsel for the petitioner had sought adjournment to get instructions as to whether the petitioner is ready and willing to return the amount to the complainant.

During the course of hearing today a somersault has been taken and counsel submits that the petitioner has no concern with the company by the name of Good Faith and the cheques were never issued by the present petitioner.

Conduct of the petitioner does not inspire confidence. Against the backdrop of the allegations, it is a case which would require a deep and thorough probe wherein innocent people are being duped of their hard earned money on the promise of attractive returns. It is a matter which may well warrant custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to extend in favour of the petitioner the concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition, accordingly, is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

15.02.2018
lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No