

\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ BAIL APPLN. 1670/2016

PARVINDER SINGH Petitioner

Through :Attendance slip not given.

versus

STATE Respondent

Through :Ms. Neelam Sharma, APP with SI
Dheer Singh, P.S. Mayur Vihar
Mr. Jaspreet Singh, Adv. for
complainant

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

% **10.11.2016**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner has not tampered with the software of complainant nor has embezzled any amount. It is one Mata Prasad, who embezzled the money. Petitioner had written a complaint to the Commissioner of Police on 2nd December, 2015 that he is likely to be initiated by the complainant, that is, the shop owner.

Learned APP submits that on 1st December, 2015, petitioner had given in writing to complainant, thereby admitted that ₹11 lacs worth cash/stock was found missing on stock checking, inasmuch as he sought

time to recheck the stock again and pointed out the discrepancy in the accounts. Subsequently, in order to cover his misdeeds, petitioner had made the complaint to the Commissioner of Police on the very next date. It is submitted that petitioner was Manager of the shop and was responsible for all the affairs of the shop including the accounting. Complainant has specifically alleged in the FIR that on 1st December, 2015 petitioner vanished with ₹1 lac, inasmuch as he had embezzled ₹11 lacs by tampering the software. Custodial interrogation is required to recover the misappropriated amount.

Keeping in mind the above facts, I am of the view that no case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail. Bail application is dismissed.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

NOVEMBER 10, 2016

rb