

211

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

CRM-M-31439-2021

Date of Decision:23.08.2021

Kawaljit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: - Mr.Sonpreet Singh Brar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Ramdeep Partap, DAG, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard by way of video conferencing.

On 12.08.2021, the following order had been passed by this

Court: -

“Case heard by video conference.

By this petition, the petitioner seeks the concession of 'anticipatory bail' under the provisions of Section 438 Cr.P.C., upon FIR No.30, dated 27.03.2021, having been registered at Police Station Kalanpur, District Gurdaspur, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Sections 420/465/468/471 of the IPC and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in the process of trying to settle the matter with the complainant in the FIR and that he may be protected only for a very limited period to enable him to do so.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice at the asking of the court on behalf of the respondent State.

A copy of the petition be supplied to him today itself by learned counsel for the petitioner In view of the above, hearing in the matter is adjourned to 23.08.2021.

In the meanwhile, till the next date of hearing only and specifically the petitioner be not arrested.

It is made clear that any request for an adjournment made on the next date of hearing by learned counsel for the petitioner, or his non-appearance, would entail immediate vacation of the interim order without any further order required to be passed in that regard.”

Today learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no fruitful settlement came out between the petitioner and the complainant.

The allegation against the petitioner being that he handed over a forged visa to the complainant after taking money from him, I see no ground to entertain this petition, which is consequently dismissed.

However, all observations made in this case are obviously in the context of a petition filed under the provision of Section 438 Cr.P.C only.

23.08.2021

Vivek

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

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