

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

(1) **CRM-M No. 22748 of 2014**
Date of Decision: 12.02.2015

Gulshan Saini
..... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
.... Respondent

(2) **CRM-M No. 32067 of 2014**

Surender
..... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
.... Respondent

(3) **CRM-M No. 32876 of 2014 (O&M)**

Dharampal @ Bablu
..... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.C. PURI.

Present: Mr. Avin Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M No. 22748 of 2014.

Mr. Sanjeev Kadian, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M No. 32067 of 2014

Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M No. 32876 of 2014.

Mr. Rajesh K. Sheoran, Addl. AG, Haryana.

K.C. PURI, J. (ORAL)

This order shall dispose of the aforementioned three petitions bearing CRM-M No. 22748 of 2014, titled as "Gulshan Saini Versus State of Haryana", CRM-M No. 32067 of 2014, titled as "Surender Versus State of Haryana" and CRM-M No. 32876 of 2014, titled as Dharampal @

Contd...P/2...

Bablu Versus State of Haryana” as all these petitions have arisen out of the same FIR.

Petitioners-Gulshan Saini, Surrender and Dharampal have applied for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 125, dated 15.02.2012, under Sections 420, 467, 471 read with Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 7/13 of P.C. Act, registered at Police Station Model Town, Panipat.

As per allegation of the prosecution, the FIR was registered at the instance of Mukesh Singla, but during the investigation, it is revealed that Tejbir Jaglan and Santosh Jaglan have been duped of Rs. 60 lacs. As per statement of Santosh Jaglan, some other persons were present when the amount was paid. Co-accused-Anil Kumar has made disclosure statement that Dharampal was also present.

Learned counsel for the petitioner-Dharampal has submitted that Santosh Jaglan and Tejbir Jaglan have not named the petitioner and as such, the petitioner is entitled for concession of anticipatory bail.

Tejbir Jaglan and Santosh Jaglan have been duped an amount of Rs. 60 lacs and the amount is yet to be recovered.

Learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that main accused-Kanwar Pal and Anil Saini have been allowed the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. However, the fact remains that allegations are that amount was paid to these persons, which have not been recovered.

So, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

Consequently, all the present petitions stands dismissed.

February 12, 2015

'dk kamra'

**(K.C. PURI)
JUDGE**