

CRM-M-61844-2018

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

CRM-M-61844-2018

Date of Decision: 25.01.2019

Jagroop Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Naveen Kashyap, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Bhavyadeep Walia, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.207 dated 23.09.2018, registered at Police Station Tripuri, District Patiala, under Sections 420 and 120-B of the IPC.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State counsel has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and complainant has also appeared through his counsel. They contested this petition.

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

From the record, I find that FIR, in the present case, has been got registered by Rajiv Saini. As per the allegations, the present petitioner

CRM-M-61844-2018

promised the complainant for getting his son recruited in govt. job. As per the allegations, ₹1.40 lakhs was deposited in the account of petitioner through RTGS and a cheque amounting to ₹1 lakh was given which was got encashed by him. An amount of ₹4,50,000/- was also deposited in the account of Gagan Cable Network. It is also stated in the FIR that an amount of ₹3,10,000/- in cash was also paid to the petitioner and other accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was doing the work of property dealer and allegations levelled against him are false. The amount of ₹1,40,000/- and ₹1 lakh was paid to the petitioner for property transaction in which a dispute arose and the present FIR has been got registered by the complainant against the petitioner.

In pursuance of the interim order dated 21.12.2018 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined the investigation. He is not required for custodial interrogation. Nothing is to be recovered from him. Therefore, no useful purpose will be served by sending him to custody.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find merit in this petition and the same is allowed. The order dated 21.12.2018, granting interim bail to the petitioner, is made absolute. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions of Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

25.01.2019

parveen kumar

Note: Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

: Yes
: No