

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

**Criminal Misc.No.M-2177 of 2015
Date of Decision: February 10, 2015**

Jai Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present: Mr.U.K.Agnihotri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Kapil Aggarwal, Addl.AG, Haryana.

Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, Jai Singh, who has been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 466, 468 and 471, IPC, in a case arising out of FIR No.437, dated 01.11.2013, registered at Police Station, City, Sonapat.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is himself a victim at the hands of his co-accused Satish and others; the petitioner had also paid the money to Satish and others for getting a service at Municipal Corporation, Delhi. He further contends that there is no evidence against the petitioner except the disclosure statement of Santosh Handa.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Joginder Singh, CIA Staff, Sonapat, submits that the petitioner is

one of the main accused. Fifteen victims of the misdeeds of petitioner have tendered their respective affidavits stating that the petitioner had allured them to get a service at Municipal Corporation, Delhi and for that, he charged Rs.1,50,000/-(Rupees One lac and fifty thousand) from each person. He further submits that in addition to the above affidavits, Santosh Handa, a co-accused of the petitioner, during his investigation had also disclosed about the complicity of the petitioner in the present scam. It has also been contended that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to unearth racket going on in the vicinity of Delhi with a motive to allure the innocent persons and induce them to pay hefty amount.

As per the allegations, Rs.95,00,000/-(Rupees Ninety Five lacs) were charged by the petitioner and his co-accused from the innocent persons on the pretext that they would be getting service at Municipal Corporation, Delhi. The petitioner and his co-accused not only got the said innocent persons medico-legally examined but also obtained their thumb impression and finger prints from sophisticated machines. There is prima facie material against the petitioner to connect him with the offences for which he has been booked. This Court is of the considered opinion that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary in the present case and as such, no grounds for grant of pre-arrest of the petitioner are made out.

Dismissed.

February 10, 2015
seema

(Naresh Kumar Sanghi)
Judge