

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

CRM No.M-21887 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: May 23, 2019

Balwinder Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Jaspreet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Dhruv Dayal, Sr.DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Vikas Sonak, Advocate for
Mr.Amaninder Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.292 dated 17.12.2018 under Sections 420, 406, 506, 294 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City Faridkot.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that the FIR in the present case has been

got registered by Sunita Rani by stating that petitioner Balwinder Singh used to ply taxi at Taxi Stand, Faridkot and his wife Paramjit Kaur is doing the work of stitching in their mohalla and in other cities. Complainant further stated that Paramjit Kaur is also doing the work of giving and taking the money and she also used to give money after getting mortgaged gold etc. As per allegations, complainant had given 15 tolas of gold and ₹1 lakh in cash to Paramjit Kaur, in front of Jasmail Kaur, which she promised to return after sometime. There was rumour in the city that both of them are leaving the city after usurping money and gold of the people.

At the time of arguments, learned State counsel contended that 21 persons have also filed the complaints regarding the fraud committed by present petitioner along with co-accused and total fraud committed till now is of ₹3,45,80,000/- and 125 tolas of gold.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstance of the present case and in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, I find that petitioner is required for custodial interrogation and no ground is made out for granting benefit of anticipatory bail to him.

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

May 23, 2019
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No