218 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.16488 of 2020
Date of Decision:21.12.2020

SHRIRAM **...Petitioner**

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB **...Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Dilraj Singh Bhinder, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Randeep S. Khaira, AAG, Punjab.

****

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Reply by way of affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Barnala, District Barnala filed in the Registry, is taken on record.

This is the third petition filed for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.09 dated 21.01.2020 registered under Sections 420/467/471/120-B IPC, at Police Station Barnala, District Barnala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The police authorities are hands-in-glove with the complainant. He further states that even as per the status report, the petitioner joined the inquiry on 29.11.2019 and had admitted in his statement that he had signed the loan documents in the State Bank of

JYOTI
2020.12.22 12:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

India, Handiaya on the asking of an unknown person, who had claimed himself to be the nephew of one Lal Singh, Inspector MARKFED. He has also stated that one of the co-accused namely, Sunil Kumar Garg @ Sunil Kumar, has already been ad-interim anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 24.02.2020.

Learned State counsel has stated that the petitioner had identified the person in the Bank for opening an account by confirming that Arjun Singh son of Bishan Singh had signed all the documents. However, when the statement of real Arjun Singh was recorded, he denied having obtained any loan from the Bank by mortgaging the land.

Earlier, the first bail petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed on merits by this Court on 13.02.2020. The second bail petition was dismissed as not pressed vide order dated 12.03.2020 passed by this Court.

There is no change of circumstance favouring the petitioner. Rather the situation is more against the petitioner inasmuch as, as noticed above, the real Arjun Singh has denied having obtained any loan by creating a mortgage. Thus, no indulgence is required to be granted to the petitioner.

In view of the above, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

December 21, 2020
Jyoti-IV

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No Whether Reportable: Yes/No

JYOTI
2020.12.22 12:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document