

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

**CRM-M No.46349 OF 2017
Date of Decision: 26.03.2018**

Hari Krishan @ Rinku Doctor

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Thind, DAG, Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.415 dated 22.08.2017 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station Civil Lines, Amritsar City.

FIR was registered with the allegations that the complainant Gurdial Singh came into contact with Dr. Yadwinder Singh and Kawaljit Singh in the year 2013 at their office of Trading Company. Accused were involved in trading of currency forex marketing and used to take money from public @ 5%

interest and invest the same in the property. Complainant fell into trap of the accused and gave an amount of Rs.28 lacs to Yadwinder Singh for investing the same in his firm @ 5% interest. Yadwinder Singh promised him to give interest of 2 months together. Allegations have been made that Yadwinder Singh did not abide by his promise, nor the amount was returned. On the asking of his brother-in-law, Yadwinder Singh gave two cheques in a sum of Rs.10 lacs each which on presentation were dishonoured. Prosecution story revolves around the aforesaid allegations. Petitioner is brother-in-law of Yadwinder Singh. Petitioner was arrested when Yadwinder Singh was at large.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that Yadwinder Singh has now been arrested and the petitioner has no role to play in the aforesaid episode.

Learned State Counsel on instructions from ASI Harjinder Singh submitted that the petitioner is marketing head of the company.

Offence is triable by the Magistrate. Challan has already been presented. Petitioner is in judicial custody since 04.09.2017. As per FIR, main allegations have been alleged against Yadwinder Singh who is in custody.

In view of above, without meaning anything on the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

March 26, 2018.	(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
Prince	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No