

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

I. CRM-M-61006-2023
Jugraj SinghPetitioner
Vs.
State of PunjabRespondent

II. CRM-M-37106-2021
Satish Kumar JainPetitioner
Vs.
State of Punjab & OthersRespondents

Reserved On : 01.05.2024
Pronounced On: 02.05.2024

CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Argued By: Mr. Amit Kumar Walia, Advocate for the
petitioner in CRM-M-61006-2023.

None for the petitioner in
CRM-M-37106-2021.

Mr. Gurpartap Singh Bhullar, AAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

1.1 In CRM-M-61006-2023 filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., petitioner
Jugraj Singh has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.383 dated
22.11.2019 under Sections 420, 120-B, 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 of the IPC
registered at Police Station Division No.8, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

1.2 CRM-M-37106-2021 was filed by the complainant in the aforesaid
FIR, namely Satish Kumar Jain, for constituting a Special Investigation Team
and to transfer the investigation to cyber incharge to unearth the truth.

CRM-M-61006-2023

2. FIR was registered on the complaint of Satish Kumar Jain alleging

that he was holding insurance policies of various insurance companies in his name and also in the name of his family members/relatives. Later, he was approached by few persons under fake names and he kept on depositing the payment of premiums. Out of 60 policies held by him, he got encashed 41 policies. Premium was collected from him in respect of the remaining policies but those were terminated. During investigation, it came out that premium so collected from the complainant was got encashed through few fake bank accounts opened by impersonation and forgery of documents.

3. Contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner has been falsely roped in; that he did job with Competent Synergies Pvt. Ltd. with effect from 01.06.2015 till 15.03.2017 and later on, in the year 2019 he had joined the office of co-accused Dushyant situated at Phase-VIII Industrial Area Mohali and worked with him only for one month. Learned counsel contends further that petitioner never worked in the insurance line; that allegations are based on documentary evidence, which is already in possession of the police; that he is ready to join the investigation and so, in all these circumstances, he be allowed anticipatory bail.

4. Strongly opposing the bail petition, learned State counsel submits that it has been found during investigation that bank accounts through which the premium of the insurance policies of the complainant was collected, had been opened by impersonation and forgery of documents and that petitioner used to call various policy holders and used to get deposited amount in the fake bank accounts. Learned State counsel submits that the *modus operandi* of the accused including the petitioner was to target innocent persons and to allure them to invest by way of insurance policies, collect cheques from them and to

encash the same through the fake bank accounts. Learned State counsel also submits that fraud of approximately ₹4 crore has been committed under the garb of insurance policies and in the manner as above, by using fake documents and that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the entire truth and so, he is not entitled for anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered submissions of both the sides and have perused the record.

6. Having regard to the enormity of the fraud committed with the complainant and the manner in which it has been committed by opening fake bank accounts by using forged documents and the role of petitioner as emerged in the investigation so far, his custodial interrogation will be very necessary to unearth the entire truth and to know the complete *modus operandi*. This court does not find the present case to be fit for grant of anticipatory bail.

As such, CRM-M-61006-2023 is hereby dismissed.

CRM-M-37106-2021

7. As far as CRM-M-37106-2021 is concerned, same was filed by the complainant in the aforesaid FIR, namely Satish Kumar Jain for constituting a Special Investigation Team and to transfer the investigation to cyber in charge to unearth the truth. However, at the time of arguments before this Court, nobody has turned up on behalf of the petitioner and so, the same is hereby dismissed in default for want of prosecution.

**(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE**

May 02, 2024

Neetika Tuteja

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No