

**CRM-M-22275-2022**

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

**CRM-M-22275-2022**

**Date of decision:23.05.2022**

Harbans Lal

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Gulzar Mohammed, Advocate,  
\\ for the petitioner.

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.49 dated 02.03.2022, registered at Police Station Bhargo Camp, Jalandhar, under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it was the complainant, who had issued a cheque of Rs.80,000/- in favour of the petitioner, in lieu of the rent of the shops due for two years; that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner, and that the case is based on documentary evidence.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

As per the prosecution version, the complainant is a tenant under the petitioner; that the complainant had taken three shops from the petitioner on rent @ Rs.4,000/- per month for each of the shop and had paid an amount of Rs.96,000/- in cash, in advance on account of rent for one

**CRM-M-22275-2022**

shop for two years; that the complainant had issued 23 cheques for Rs.8,000/- each for monthly rent of remaining two shops; that on 16.01.2020, the complainant received a message on his mobile that an amount of Rs.80,000/- had been debited to his account, vide cheque No.00927 dated 15.01.2020, issued by him, but it was actually issued by him for Rs.8,000/-; that on inquiry, it was found that the amount of Rs.8,000/- had been converted into Rs.80,000/- by adding '0' and similarly in words by adding alphabet 'y', the amount in words had been converted from Eight to Eighty.

Learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, while dismissing the bail application of the petitioner, noticed that as per the statement of account of the complainant, the cheques for Rs.8,000/- each had regularly been cleared and debited to his account and further credited to the account of the petitioner, but only one cheque, amounting to Rs.80,000/-, had been debited to the account of the complainant.

A bare perusal of the FIR would show that the petitioner had not only committed forgery with the complainant, but with the bank also.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court finds that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to unearth the aforesaid forgery.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

**23.05.2022**

parveen kumar

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)**

**JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No