

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: 24.08.2015

a) CRM-M No.23386 of 2015

Bhagat Singh Kanungo (Regd.) ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

b) CRM-M No.23448 of 2015

Takdir Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. Bipan Ghai, Sr. Advocate,
with Mr. Paras Talwar, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M No.23386 of 2015).

Mr. Anshumaan Dalal, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M No.23448 of 2015).

Mr. Gaurav Dhir, DAG, Haryana.

Rajan Gupta, J. (oral)

This order shall dispose of two petitions bearing CRM-M No.23386 of 2015 and CRM-M No.23448 of 2015 arising out of same incident.

Petitioners, in these petitions, seek pre-arrest bail in a case registered against them vide FIR No.178 dated 01.07.2015 under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 472, 201 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Old Sabji Mandi, Rohtak, District Rohtak.

Mr. Ghai, learned Senior counsel has argued that there is no

complicity of the petitioner in the crime. Land owners were given compensation. They withdrew the amount from the bank after due verification. Thus, petitioners are entitled to pre-arrest bail.

Prayer has been opposed by learned State counsel. He has referred to reply filed by way of affidavit of Amit Bhatia, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Rohtak. According to him, petitioners in connivance with bank officials disbursed the cheques and misappropriated government money to the tune of ₹ 2.5 Crores. According to him, petitioner-Bhagat Singh himself came to the bank in company of Land Acquisition Officer Jai Dev and his daughter-in-law, who was working in the bank and got the cheques honoured. These persons later got some fake records prepared and misled the department. Original record was destroyed. In this manner, payment was released to persons who were not entitled to receive the same in terms of award.

Keeping in view nature of allegations levelled in the FIR, affidavit filed by the investigating agency before this Court, I am of the considered view that petitioners are not entitled to concession of pre-arrest bail.

Dismissed.

24.08.2015

sukhpreet

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE