

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

CRM-M-4528-2019

Date of decision:15.5.2019

RESHAM SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Satish Kumar Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, AAG, Punjab assisted by HC Harmail
Singh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in respect of FIR No.66 dated 28.8.2016 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, Police Station City Rampura, District Bathinda.
2. The allegations in nut-shell are that the petitioner had introduced the complainant to one Rishu Sharma and that the accused took an amount of ₹2,000/- from the complainant for the purpose of

preparing a bogus driving license.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that even as per allegations levelled in FIR, the petitioner had merely introduced the complainant with Rishu Sharma for the purpose of facilitating issuance of driving license and it cannot be inferred that he knew that Rishu Sharma prepares fake diving licences. It is further submitted that in any case it was Rishu Sharma who used to prepare bogus driving licenses with the help of his computer, which has already been recovered from co-accused and as such the petitioner cannot be connected with alleged bogus driving license.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner had introduced the complainant with the main accused-Rishu Sharma, his complicity is evident and no ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and bearing in mind the nature of allegations, it would certainly be debatable as to whether the petitioner is in league with Rishu Sharma or not. In any case, the equipment used for preparation of bogus driving license has already been recovered. In these circumstances, I do not find it to be a case of custodial interrogation. Accordingly the petition is accepted and the interim directions issued vide dated 31.01.2019 by this Court are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner would appear before Investigating Officer as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide

by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

6. It is, however, clarified that none of the observations made above shall be construed to be an expression on merits of the main case.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

15.5.2019
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No