

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.

CRM M-31423 of 2016
Date of Decision: October 18, 2016

Ankur MalhotraPetitioner
Vs.

UT of ChandigarhRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI.

-. -

Present:- Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sukant Gupta, APP for UT.

-. -

M.M.S. BEDI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is one of the accused persons involved in the scam of registration of vehicles with the Regional Licencing Authority, Chandigarh in which the investigating agency has found that on the basis of fake and fabricated documents registration of vehicles have been made on the basis of invoices under- valuing the vehicles. Challan has already been presented.

So far as petitioner is concerned, the allegation against him is that he had received a total sum of Rs.2000/- i.e. at the rate of Rs.500/- per car which was got registered in the names of Sanjay Arora, M/s Bansal Motors, M/s DD Plywood Pvt. Ltd. and Amit Goyal. The owners of the said luxury cars paid inadequate road tax in connivance with Kamaljit Verma in the office of Registering and Licencing Authority, Chandigarh. The petitioner has been involved in the case on the basis of the statement made by co-accused Kamaljit Verma.

Mr. Sukant Gupta, assisted by SI Charanjit Singh has vehemently contended that the petitioner has destroyed pen drive as per the statement of Abhishek Gupta recorded during the course of investigation. He has also argued that the allegations against the petitioner regarding the luxury cars having been wrongly registered are in process. He has argued that on account of involvement of the petitioner in serious economic offence, he should not be granted the concession of bail.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner and the State counsel and gone through the record. Since the challan has already been presented, the chances of tampering with the evidence are remote. As the petitioner has been in custody w.e.f. July 6, 2016, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody.

Petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/ surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court subject to the conditions that the petitioner will not leave India without the permission of the Court and will not commit the similar offence of which he is accused of during the pendency of the trial. In case of any such eventuality, it will be open to the prosecution agency to seek the cancellation of bail.

October 18, 2016
sanjay

(M.M.S.BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes/ No.
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No.