

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

Date of decision : November 30, 2016

1. CRM-M No.21110 of 2016

Randhir and another vs State of Haryana

2. CRM-M No.36392 of 2016

Swaroop @ Sarup Singh vs State of Haryana

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. RA Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRM-M No.21110 of 2016.

Mr. Shalender Mohan, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M No.36392 of 2016

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl. AG Haryana

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

This order shall dispose of the aforesaid both the petitions.

The petitioners seek grant of regular bail in case FIR
No.232, dated 12.9.2015, registered under Sections 468, 471, 467, 120B
of the IPC, at Police Station Bawani Khera, District Bhiwani.

Allegations are that the petitioners had obtained loan on the

basis of forged documents. At one stage, the State was asked to ascertain the role of various bank officials without whose help the fraud could not have been perpetrated.

On the last date, the following order was passed :-

“ Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Ramesh, states that as per the investigation, the then bank manager was not found to be involved in the fraud but the involvement of the then field officer has been found and prays that the present petitions be deferred to enable to police to arrest that field officer because one attempt has not proved successful.

Adjourned to 30.11.2016. This shall be the last opportunity.

A copy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.”

Learned Addl. AG Haryana states that the said Field Officer is on the run and efforts are being made to apprehend him.

Counsel for the petitioners state that petitioners Randhir and Sanjay have now been in custody for eight months, and petitioner Swaroop @ Sarup Singh has been in custody for more than five months, and it is a case of Magisterial trial. Even if the absconding Field Officer is arrested, trial will be further delayed.

Learned Addl. AG Haryana has accepted these factual assertions.

In these circumstances, without commenting upon the merits of the case, and keeping in view the period of custody already

CRM-M No.21110 of 2016

::3::

suffered by the petitioners, I do not deem it appropriate to deny the concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

Bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

Petitions stand disposed of.

November 30, 2016

`kk'

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No