

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

CRM M-52781 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: November 06, 2020

Jagjit SinghPetitioner
Versus
State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present : Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Harjot Singh Bedi, Advocate
for the complainant.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J. (Oral)

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing on account of lockdown due to outbreak of pandemic COVID-19.

Petitioner Jagjit Singh who is in custody has come up in this fourth petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. moved in case bearing FIR No. 68 dated 19.04.2017 under Sections 498-A, 420, 419, 494, 495, 465, 467, 468, 471, 406, 376, 376-D,

506 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Division No. 7, District Jalandhar.

Upon hearing Mr. Amit Dhawan, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG, Punjab and Mr. Harjot Singh Bedi learned counsel for the complainant and perusal of the records.

The present case was got registered on the complaint of one Navjot Kaur. In her complaint the complainant alleges that she got married with petitioner through marriage bureau in January 2017. At the time of entering into the wedlock the accused is alleged to have misrepresented that he was residing in California carrying on trucking business. It was after the marriage the complainant realized that petitioner was a cheat and had been on the sly giving her sedation and robbed her of her wealth and whenever she refused was physically and mentally tortured. The accused had managed to illegally rob money from the account of the complainant and her father and threatened her.

Mr. Amit Dhawan, learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner is behind the bars since 03 years and 03 months and that in view of the present Pandemic Covid 19 situation, the trial is not to be facilitated in the near future. Learned counsel for the petitioner has laid much stress

on the falsity of the claim and that no case of either robbing much less getting robbed was made out.

Mr. Harbir Sandhu, learned State counsel has strongly opposed the bail on the grounds that the petitioner is habitual to commission of cheating and has detailed four cases registered by way of FIR No. 291 dated 05.10.2017 under Section 52 Prison Act Police Station Kotwali, Kapurthala; FIR No. 15 dated 18.01.2011 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC Police Station Sadar Jalandhar; FIR no. 56 dated 18.05.2010 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC Police Station Goraya, Jalandhar and FIR No. 336 dated 23.10.2007 under Section 420 IPC Police Station City Phagwara, District Kapurthala against him and has submitted that if allowed bail the petitioner might abscond. It is submitted that the petitioner in similar manner has performed three other marriages. The petitioner has come in this 4th regular bail application. The earlier three have been declined and dismissed by this Court.

Counsel for the petitioner could not convince this Court what fresh grounds have come about more so and in view of the criminal history of the petitioner placed on the record in the reply of the State and the apprehension of the State that if allowed the bail, the petitioner might abscond is not unfounded.

No case is made out for grant of bail and as such the present petition stands dismissed.

November 06, 2020
amit rana

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No