



205

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-24431-2024

Date of decision: 05.11.2024

Jatinder Pal Sekhon alias Jatinder Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE **AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. Satbir Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl.A.G. Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

Petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.76, dated 22.04.2022, under Sections 420, 34, 506 and 120-B of IPC registered at Police Station City Sunam, District Sangrur.

2. As per facts of the case, Baljinder Singh-complainant stated that on 24.12.2021 he along with his friend Satnam Singh was present when an agent Manjit Singh came to purchase a Mule for a sum of Rs.93,000/-. Said agent Manjit Singh further disclosed to him and Satnam Singh that he wanted to buy a horse of superior breed. On this, they checked whatsapp group dealing in horses. They came to know that one Jatinder Pal Sekhon and Lakhwinder Singh were having horses for sale. Manjit Singh decided with them to visit Sunam on 26.12.2021. The complainant along with his friend Satnam Singh reached the house of Jatinder Pal Sekhon and Lakhwinder Singh where Manjit Singh and

Lachra Khan @ Goga Khan were already present and it appeared that



Manjit Singh knew Jatinder Pal Sekhon. A deal was struck to purchase superior quality horse for a sum of Rs.14 lacs. The horse was to be kept in the house of complainant and after its sale, profit was to be shared by them. Manjit Singh paid Rs.2 lacs to Jatinder Pal Sekhon whereas he along with Satnam Singh paid cash of Rs.12 lacs to Jatinder Pal Sekhon. Horse was sent to his house in vehicle on same night. As the Horse was given bath, its black colour was washed away and it came out to be a red horse. On the very next day, he went to the house of Jatinder Singh that he had delivered horse alleging it to be of black colour and committed fraud with him. He demanded back the sale proceeds but Jatinder Pal Sekhon refused rather he extended threats to him and Satnam Singh. Ultimately, the matter was reported to the police.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that all the allegations levelled against him are false. Petitioner is falsely implicated in this case at the instance of Ramesh Kumar with whom he had previous enmity and another FIR No.73 dated 19.04.2022 was registered against him under Sections 420, 34, 506 and 120-B IPC, at the instance of Ramesh Kumar. Said Ramesh Kumar had issued two cheques in favour of the petitioner and the same were dishonoured. As a result, he filed complaint under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act against Ramesh Kumar (Annexure P-2) and in order to put pressure on him, he is falsely involved in this case. Version put forward by the complainant is not believable that they were carrying Rs.14 lacs for purchasing a horse and the entire payment was made on the spot. Petitioner is ready to join the investigation. It is prayed that his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing



State. Detailed status report has been filed. Present petitioner is yet to join the investigation and thereafter challan will be presented. Specific role is attributed to him. Huge amount is received by the petitioner and thereafter horse was supplied which was not of superior quality as demanded by the complainant. Therefore, petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Present petitioner is specifically named for selling horse along with Lakhwinder Singh and received huge amount of Rs.14 lacs i.e. Rs.12 lacs from the complainant and Satnam Singh and Rs.2 lacs from Manjit Singh. Thereafter, black horse was allegedly sent to the house of the complainant and at the time of bathing the horse, it was revealed that it was of red colour. Petitioner is required to join the investigation.

6. Considering the specific allegations and the huge amount involved in this case, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

05.11.2024
monika

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes /No
2. Whether reportable : Yes /No