

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

CRM-M-49765-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 29.11.2021

Sukhjinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

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

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 102 dated 18.10.2021 registered under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Cantt. Bathinda, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner pleads the petitioner's false implication and there being no concern of him with the co-accused. It is further contended that the petitioner's daughter, had studied in the Army Public School from Class 2nd onwards, but while in 10th standard, she had left studying in the said School; that the petitioner had deposited the fee of his

daughter in the said School, from time to time and hence, the petitioner was under the impression that the money transferred by the School in his bank account was on account of the refund of the fee paid for the study of his daughter. It is further submitted that co-accused, Ex-Principal has already been granted bail by the learned trial Court.

It is a case, in which, the alleged amount was transferred in the account of the petitioner in the year 2018, but the petitioner did not bother either intimating the Bank or the School authorities about the said fact, which clearly points a mala-fide motive on his part. Still further, though the petitioner pleads that he has no connection with the crime in question, yet the fact remains that the petitioner is the neighbour of co-accused, Yashvir Sharma, Ex-Accountant of the School, and there are specific allegations in the FIR that the amount was got credited to the account of the petitioner in connivance with the co-accused, including said Yashvir Sharma. Thus, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

In view of the above, the petitioner does not deserve concession of the anticipatory bail, therefore, the same is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

29.11.2021
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No