

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

**CRM No.M-43869 of 2015 (O&M)**  
**Date of decision: December 24, 2015**

Arpit Mittal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH**

Present: Dr.Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with  
Mr.Shranav Katyal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**INDERJIT SINGH, J.**

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.290 dated 10.08.2015 under Sections 406, 420 IPC, Sections 3 and 4 of the Chit Fund Act, 1982 and Section 3 of Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2014, registered at Police Station Sector-5, District Panchkula.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that there is changed circumstance in the present case. Firstly, as per Annexure P-16, a civil suit has been filed for rendition of account and secondly, learned Addl. Sessions Judge has granted bail to the co-accused and the criminal writ petition has been filed as per Annexure P-13, in which notice has been issued and the case is of civil nature. It is also argued

that the Chit Fund Act, 1982 has not been notified in the State of Haryana.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and after going through the record, I find that this Court has already dismissed on merits the bail petition of the present petitioner. Keeping in view the fact that civil suit has been filed or Chit Fund Act is not notified, are no grounds for accepting this second anticipatory bail petition. In the earlier order dated 24.08.2015 passed by this Court after discussing the facts of the case, it has been held that petitioner is required for custodial interrogation. There is no changed circumstance to show that petitioner is now not required for custodial interrogation. It is also held in that order that amount of ₹8 crores is yet to be recovered from the accused persons. Mere filing of civil suit or filing petition challenging the FIR, cannot be held as changed circumstance.

In view of the above discussion, I do not find any merit in the present petition and the same is dismissed.

**December 24, 2015**  
Vgulati

**(INDERJIT SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**