

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-17011-2019

Date of Decision: 06.05.2019

Jagdish Lal

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: - Mr. Yowan Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hittan Nehra, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate for the complainant.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for complainant-Inder Jain, has filed Vakalatnama, on his own, though he has not been impleaded as party. The same is taken on record. Office to tag the same at the appropriate place.

Through this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 54 dated 02.03.2019 registered under Sections 406, 420, 4654, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station Salem Tabri, District Ludhiana.

According to the prosecution, the petitioner along with his son-in-law, namely; Vijender Kumar, who was handling the bank accounts of complainant's firms under the names and style, M/s Mohan Lal International and M/s Nav Yug Enterprises, for the last five years, daughter-Mona, who was also working with the aforesaid firms as part

time, cheated and defrauded the complainant's firms for around Rs.80,00,000/-, through various transactions.

Learned counsel *inter alia* contends that petitioner is in custody since 26.03.2019. There is not even a single document with the prosecution to show the complicity of the petitioner in commission of crime. He has falsely been implicated in the instant case being father-in-law of main accused-Vijender Kumar. Conclusion of trial may take sufficient long time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner behind bars.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant strongly opposing the submissions of learned counsel petitioner contends that the petitioner, his daughter and son-in-law cheated and defrauded the complainant for a huge sum of Rs.80,00,000/-. In case, he would enlarged on bail, he shall tamper the evidence as there is likelihood of his threatening to the prosecution witnesses.

Considering the seriousness of allegations levelled against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

May 06, 2019
rishu

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No