

CRM-M-36784-2018

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

CRM-M-36784-2018

Date of Decision: 04.09.2018

Gurlal Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. B.S.Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for brevity, 'Cr.P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.90 dated 09.12.2016, registered at Police Station Kotbhai, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 4 and 5 of the Prize Chits and Money Circulation Schemes Banning Act, 1978.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State counsel 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 gone through the record.

CRM-M-36784-2018

From the record, I find that FIR, in the present case, has been registered by one Jaswant Singh against the present petitioner-Gurlal Singh and Baljinder Singh alleging that a lucky draw scheme under the name of Guru Kirpa was started and each member had to deposit ₹1300/- per month for 14 months i.e. total amounting to ₹18,200/- and the accused persons had to continue this scheme from October, 2014 to December, 2015 and in the end, they had to pay ₹20,000/- to every member in cash or in alternative, they would conduct a lucky draw. As per the allegations, the members deposited every installment, but at the end of the scheme, an amount of ₹20,000/- was not given and even LCD given in the lucky draw was also found to be duplicate. Perusal of record shows that in this case, SIT has been formed and it has reached to the conclusion that complainant in this case as well as Gurlal Singh and Baljinder Singh have started the scheme and they have cheated the innocent villagers and have committed fraud etc.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has mainly relied upon the inquiry conducted before formation of SIT, but the SIT is also headed by the Superintendent of Police and Deputy Superintendent of Police etc. The SIT has found the involvement of the present petitioner in the commission of offence.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of the fact that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

CRM-M-36784-2018

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

04.09.2018
parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

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