

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

CRM-M-31621-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-23.8.2021

Baldev Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Gurpal Singh Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh, DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Dalbir Singh

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered vide FIR No.183 dated 10.7.2021 under Sections 420, 468, 471/120-B IPC at Police Station City Muktsar, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Lakhwinder Singh who has lodged the same on behalf of himself and four others. The allegations, in nutshell, are that the complainant Lakhwinder Singh was working in Malwa Ortho Hospital on contract basis. In the month of March, 2019, the Govt. of Punjab had advertised posts of Radiographers in Civil Hospitals, which were to be filled up on the basis of interviews to be conducted at Civil Hospital, Bathinda on 20.3.2019. Gurpreet Kaur wife of Baldev Singh met the complainant in Civil Hospital, Sri Muktsar Sahib and represented that she could get a government job as a Radiographer for the complainant as her

husband had good contacts and demanded an amount of ₹ 3 lacs. Since the said lady was also working in Civil Hospital, Sri Muktsar Sahib as a Computer Operator, the complainant trusted her and gave an amount of ₹10,000/- initially on 2nd or 3rd April, 2019 and later on the same day gave another ₹20,000/- to her which were handed over at her residence where her husband Baldev Singh was also present. However, when the result was declared, the name of the complainant was not there. When the complainant confronted the aforesaid Gupreet Kaur and her husband Baldev Singh, they kept on lingering the matter and assured that the complainant would be provided with a job in AIIMS Hospital, Bathinda. During the said period, the complainant came to know that one Ramandeep Kaur and Sukhmander Singh, who were related to him were also in touch with Baldev Singh for the purpose of securing a job and Baldev Singh had demanded an amount of ₹ 3 lacs from each of them. Baldev Singh introduced the complainant and others to Sukhbir Singh who had interviewed them and who assured that their job will be done. Later, the complainant and others made more payments to the accused including some payments made in bank accounts. However, the complainant and others were not given any appointment and later lock-down came to be imposed on account of pandemic and thereafter, the accused stated that since the circumstances had changed, therefore, they will get the complainants appointed under National Health Resources Reponsitory on contractual basis and the same was also a government Job. The complainants were given appointment letters by Sukhjinder Singh and were also issued Identity Cards and were imparted training for about one week wherein there were other candidates also. During the said period Baldev Singh and Sukhjinder Singh stated that they have to appoint more

persons and that in case the complainant and others knew anybody, who was interested, such person could be appointed. The complainant accordingly introduced Karamvir Singh, Harmanpreet Kaur and Ramandeep Kaur. The said persons demanded an amount of ₹ 2 lacs from each of them. The said persons were also issued appointment letters and I-Cards who had deposited the amounts in the accounts of Baldev Singh, Sukhjinder Singh, Gurpreet Kaur and Sukhbir Singh Bawa apart from having given amount in cash. Later, after having worked for about one month when the complainant demanded salary, they were put off on the ground that verification process was going on. Later, when complainants started suspecting them and made inquiries from the head office of the company, it was found that Sukhjinder Singh was neither the agent nor employee of the company and that Baldev Singh, Sukhjinder Singh and Sukhbir Singh had all prepared forged joining letters, I-Cards and other documents. Later, when the complainant tried to contact the said persons, they were able to contact them only through unknown numbers and when the accused were confronted, they issued a cheque for an amount of ₹3 lacs, which was dishonoured. It is alleged that the accused had, thus, defrauded the complainants of an amount of ₹10,50,000/-.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the instant case and that there is no evidence to substantiate the allegations levelled by the complainant. It has further been submitted that the matter in hand is based totally on documentary evidence, it would not justify custodial interrogation. The petitioner has, thus, prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that the accused alongwith other co-accused have been running a well knit scam of providing bogus appointments and had defrauded several persons and as such, does not deserve the concession of bail.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. The petitioner is the main accused, who is alleged to have defrauded several persons against whom there are allegations of running a scam of issuing bogus appointment letters. Not only appointment letters, the accused in order to attract more gullible job aspirants, was also imparting some kind of sham training to make the entire process look genuine and in this manner had deprived several persons of their hard earned money. Some of the payments are also alleged to have been made through bank transactions.
7. Keeping in view the serious nature of allegations and also to unearth the entire *modus-operandi* and to find out as to how many other persons are also involved, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessary.
8. The petition, as such, is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

23.8.2021

kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No