



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

CRM-M No.21484 of 2024
Date of decision: 16th May, 2024

Gurbhej Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Inder Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.
Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.0099 dated 31.07.2023 for the offences under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station Jhabal, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Salvinder Singh, has submitted that no doubt no money was transferred into the account of the petitioner, however, all the forged documents were prepared with his connivance, in his house and at his behest. On further instructions, he has submitted that complicity of the petitioner in the crime in question is further supported by an affidavit given by none other than him, wherein he had given an undertaking that he would clear the loan amount of his account No.305 ICICI Bank. Learned State



counsel has placed on record a copy of the said undertaking, wherein the aforesaid fact stands reflected.

3. Learned counsel for the complainant has reiterated the allegations levelled against the petitioner in the FIR in question; it has also been brought to the notice of this Court that another complaint has been given against the petitioner by ICICI Bank qua obtaining another loan from the Bank on the basis of forged documents.

4. It has been further submitted that the learned trial Court, while passing the impugned order, had also made categorical observations about the undertaking given by the petitioner that he would repay the amount taken by him as loan, on the basis of forged documents. Learned State counsel thus, submits that in the circumstances, contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner that he had no role to play in the crime in question and that he had been nominated only on the basis of a disclosure statement, holds no water.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court concurs with the submissions made by the learned State counsel that custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessitated in view of the fraud which has been played upon a financial institution. This Court thus, does not deem it fit to grant the

extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the instant case. The petition stands dismissed. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

May 16, 2024
rps

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