

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

(I) CRM-M-11203-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-25.3.2019

Tarwinder Singh	Versus	... Petitioner
State of Punjab		... Respondent

(II) CRM-M-11740-2019 (O&M)

Gurpreet Singh	Versus	... Petitioner
State of Punjab		... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. B.D. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

This order shall dispose of aforesaid two petitions filed on behalf of petitioners Tarwinder Singh and Gurpreet Singh seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against them FIR No.5 dated 30.1.2019 at Police Station Station Kotali Surat Malhi, District Batala under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860.

The FIR was lodged at the instance of Balwinder Kumar, wherein it has been alleged that the accused Gurpreet Singh and Arvinder Singh @ Rinku had induced the complainant to invest his money while promising him lucrative returns. It is the case of the complainant that he

alongwith Jyoti Bala and Neeru Bala had invested an amount to the tune of ₹9,64,000/-, as the complainant had promised a return to the tune of ₹18,18,700/-. However, only an amount of ₹65,000/- was returned and despite the demands made by the complainant no further amount was paid to the complainant and to others.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners were merely working as employees of the company which was being run by Ajit Singh, who is the main accused and that in these circumstances no liability can be fastened upon the petitioners and they cannot be held responsible as they are not the beneficiaries.

Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioners are specifically named in the FIR and it is the petitioners, who had received the amount in question, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out as it is by way of custodial interrogation that entire modus-operandi will be unearthed and involvement of any other accused could be known.

Having considered rival submissions addressed before this Court and bearing in mind the specific allegations against the petitioners as regards entrustment of the amount upon a promise held out by them for lucrative return, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail. There is no merit in either of the petition. Both the petitions are dismissed.

25.3.2019

pankaj

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge