

**In the Court of Sh. Daljit Singh Ralhan, Additional Sessions Judge
Mansa. (PB0198)**

File No.79 dated 15.02.2019
CIS No.BA/176/2019
CNR No. PBMN010004802019
Date of order: 22.02.2019

1. Sukhwinder Singh aged about 41 years, son of Megh Raj,
2. Balwinder Singh aged about 39 years, son of Megh Raj,

Both residents of Jamal Patti, village Ralla Tehsil and District
Mansa.

----- Applicants/ accused.

Versus

State of Punjab

FIR No. 12 dated 14.02.2019
Under Sections: 420/406 IPC
Police Station: Bhikhi District Mansa.

Application for anticipatory bail u/s 438 Cr.P.C.

Present:- Sh. G.S. Mann, Advocate for applicant/ accused.
Sh. D.S. Sran, Addl.PP for the State.
Sh. H.S. Mann, Advocate for complainant.

ORDER:

This order of mine will dispose of anticipatory bail
application filed by accused/applicants Sukhwinder Singh and Balwinder
Singh.

2. Accused/ applicants have alleged that they are innocent
persons. They have not committed any offence. Nothing is to be recovered

from the accused/ applicant and prayed for anticipatory bail on this ground.

3. Notice of bail application was given to the Addl. PP for the State, who appeared and contested the bail application. Police record has been summoned.

4. Ld. Counsel for accused/ applicant has pressed for bail on the ground that applicant / accused has not committed any offence. Nothing is to be recovered from accused/ applicant. No custodial interrogation of applicants/ accused is required and as such bail may be granted to the accused / applicants.

5. On the other hand, ld. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application and has pressed for dismissal of the bail application.

6. After hearing respective contentions and perusal of the record reveals the fact that applicants/ accused Sukhwinder Singh and Balwinder Singh have purchased crops during different years from Harbans Dass Bawa and his family members through their firm Bawa Trading Company. But they did not deposit amount of said crops in their account and prepared forged statements. The allegations are serious in nature. Recovery is yet to be effected. Custodial interrogation must be required to the police. As such, in view of the seriousness of the allegations and gravity of the offence, this Court is of the considered view that accused / applicants do not deserve concession of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, present application stands dismissed. Record be returned alongwith copy

of this order and record of bail application be consigned to record room after due compilation.

Pronounced.
Dated: 22.02.2019.
Avinash

(Daljit Singh Ralhan)
Addl. Sessions Judge
Mansa.(PB0198)

Sukhwinder Singh etc. Vs. State

Present:- Sh. G.S. Mann, Advocate for applicant/ accused.
Sh. D.S. Sran, Addl.PP for the State.
Sh. H.S. Mann, Advocate for complainant.

Arguments on application filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail by accused / applicant, heard. Vide separate detailed order of even date, the same stands dismissed. Record be returned and record of bail application be consigned to record room after due compilation.

Pronounced.
Dated: 22.02.2019.

(Daljit Singh Ralhan)
Addl. Sessions Judge
Mansa.(PB0198)

Avinash