

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-44914 of 2017

Date of decision:13.8.2018

Baljinder Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.90 dated 9.12.2016 registered
for the offences under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC
and under Sections 4 and 5 of Prize Chits and Money Circulation Schemes
Banning Act, 1978 at Police Station Kotbhai, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Notice of motion was issued in this case.

Mr. Karanbir Singh, learned Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab has appeared 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.

As per the FIR, the present petitioner is named in the FIR and he along with Gurlal Singh started one Lucky Draw Scheme (hereinafter referred to as 'the Scheme') under the name of Guru Kirpa in which each member has to deposit ₹1300/- per month for 14 months. In this manner, every member has to deposit a total sum of ₹18,200/- per month and the accused persons have to continue this scheme from October 2014 to December 2015. In the end of the Scheme, they have to pay ₹20,000/- to every member in cash or alternatively they would conduct a Lucky Draw. The accused persons asked the complainant if he makes more members of this Scheme, then they will pay him ₹1,000/- per member as commission. As per the complainant, he made 316 members of the Scheme. As per the allegations, the amount has not been paid and the complainant and other members have been cheated.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the complainant was also made an accused in the present case.

After going through the facts and circumstances of the present case, there are serious allegations against the present petitioner and the fact that he is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled for the grant of anticipatory bail.

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

August 13, 2018.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE: Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No