

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

**CRM-M No.19876 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 28.09.2015**

Krishan Kumar Saini

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Doon, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent along with SI Chattarpal Singh.

Mr. Jitender Dhanda, Advocate for the complainant.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.412 dated 22.04.2015, under Section 420, IPC (Sections 406, 210 and 120-B, IPC added later on), registered with Police Station Hissar City, District Hissar.

The allegations are that all the Office Bearers of the Hissar Adarsh Postal Employees Urban Cooperative Society Limited (SETC) [for short 'the Society'] are involved in embezzlement, misuse and irregularities in utilizing fund of the Society as depicted from the Audit Report. The amount involved is stated to be huge and the petitioner at the relevant time was the Secretary of the said Society.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the interim direction dated 16.06.2015 and subsequent order dated 17.07.2015, the petitioner has joined the investigation and no recovery is to be effected from him. It is also submitted that the President of the Society has since been granted regular bail.

Reply by way of affidavit dated 23.09.2015 of Sh. Jaipal Singh, DSP, Hisar on behalf of the respondent has been filed, which is taken on record.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Chatterpal Singh, states that on the basis of the documentary evidence collected during investigation, it has been revealed that a sum of Rs. 1.5 Lacs was received by the petitioner from M/s Priya Packaging Industry and the same was not deposited in the account of the Society. The account books for the year 2000 to 2013 are to be recovered from the petitioner for which the petitioner is alleged to have lodged a missing report and, therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

After hearing learned Counsel for the parties, it is felt that keeping in view the seriousness of the nature of the charges, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner might/would be required to complete the chain of the investigation.

In view of the above, the present petition stands dismissed.

September 28, 2015

Gagan

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**