

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

CRM-M No. 21473 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.09.2016

Surinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Pankaj Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.
assisted by SI Bhim Singh.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in case FIR No.722, dated 02.06.2016, registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station City Panipat.

The learned counsel for the petitioner states that petitioner is ready and willing to deposit a part of the amount. The petitioner has retired and he has an unblemished career. After his retirement, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. No specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. Moreover, there is a huge delay of 03 years on lodging the instant FIR. In support of his contentions, the learned counsel cites **Bhadresh**

Bipinbhai Sheth Vs. **State of Gujarat and another**, (2016) 1 SCC 152 and **Arnesh Kumar** Vs. **State of Bihar and another**, (2014) 8 SCC 273.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel, on instructions from Ms. Rohit, District Manager submits that the District Manager is the drawing and disbursing authority and during his service, he has embezzled a huge amount. This amount was earmarked for Haryana Domiciled girls as per a scheme of Haryana Women Development Corporations. The amount can in no case be released without his approval or connivance.

Heard.

Keeping in view the serious allegations against the petitioner and the fact that the recovery of amount is yet to be effected, therefore, this Court feels that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in the matter. Therefore, no case for bail is made out. The ratio of case law cited by the learned counsel is distinguishable on facts and will not apply to the facts of the instant case. Dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

07.09.2016

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes	No
Yes	No