

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

CRM-M-48833-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 2.3.2020

Pargat Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Kuljit Singh Bal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case registered vide FIR No.81, dated 18.8.2019, Police Station Ramdas, District Amritsar Rural, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC.
2. The FIR in question was registered at the instance of Major Singh wherein it has been alleged that his son Jaskaran Singh was unemployed and was looking for a job and that he came to know through his relative Jagjit Singh that Surjit Singh knew some important persons in the Government and could arrange for

employment. The complainant met Surjit Singh who represented that he could get complainant's son recruited as an Inspector in Food and Supply Department and that although he normally takes an amount of ₹15 lakhs for the said job but he would secure employment for his son for an amount of ₹11.30 lakhs. It is alleged that at the time of said representation, a friend of Surjit Singh namely Sandeep was also present there and that they asked the complainant, his son Jaskaran and Jagjit Singh to come to Chandigarh and where they got the complainant introduced with one Simranjit Singh Randhawa while referring to him as A.O.S.D./Principal Secretary and assured that the work would be done. It is further alleged that despite the said assurances, the complainant's son was not got employed although the complainant had given the amount which the accused had asked for to his relative Jagjit Singh who had further given the same to Surjit Singh through Bank.

3. It is further the case of prosecution that even Jagjit Singh had submitted a complaint against Surjit Singh, his wife Sandeep Kaur, Sandeep Singh, Pargat Singh and Simranjit Singh to the effect that Surjit Singh had even defrauded him while holding out a representation that he would get him employed in FCI godown and had taken an amount of ₹3 lakhs from him. He further stated therein that Surjit Singh had represented that he could arrange for the employment through Simranjit Singh Randhawa stated to be OSD to CM. He further stated that he had also told about Surjit Singh to his relative Major Singh who was also interested in getting his son

Jaskaran Singh employed and being taken in by the representation of Surjit Singh he had also passed on the amount as had been demanded by Surjit Singh. He further stated that one Pargat Singh was also present with Simranjit Singh when they were introduced to him. It is further alleged that subsequently another of their relative namely Amar Singh also paid an amount of ₹1.5 lakhs to Surjit Singh and Pargat Singh for getting a job of Security Guard in FCI godown out of which ₹50,000/- was given in cash and the remaining was transferred in the account of Surjit Singh. Jagjit Singh further alleged that he talked to Surjit Singh for job of Ramandeep Kaur and Surjit Singh gave assurance that he will get Ramandeep Kaur recruited as Inspector in Food Supply Department and demanded ₹7 lakhs. He, Ramandeep Kaur, Jaskaran Singh, Surjit Singh and Sandeep Singh went to Chandigarh where they met Simranjit Singh and Pargat Singh. It is alleged that they transferred an amount of ₹12.80 lakhs in the bank account of Surjit Singh and remaining amount was given in cash and out of that an amount of ₹50,000/- was given to Sandeep Kaur w/o Surjit Singh.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that there is no such allegation against him to show that he was also involved in the alleged fraud.
5. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since there are specific allegations to the effect that he was also present on some of the occasions when false representations had been

held out by main accused Surjit Singh and since some amount is also stated to have been handed over to him, no special case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

6. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. Keeping in view the nature of allegations and the fact that the petitioner is stated to have been accompanying the other accused when they had been holding out false representations, his complicity in the entire occurrence is clearly evident. In these circumstances, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
7. The petition is sans any merit and the same is hereby dismissed.

March 2, 2020
mohan

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No