

CRM-M-31425-2016

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

CRM-M-31425-2016

Date of Decision: 21.09.2016

Shankar Jha

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Jagjot Singh Lalli, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shivali, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Patiyal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.102 dated 30.06.2016, registered at Police Station Division No.6, Industrial Area, Ludhiana City, under Sections 408, 477-A and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State counsel put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and the complainant also appeared through his counsel. They contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner; learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant and have gone through the record.

As per the version of FIR, the present petitioner was working as Deputy Branch Manager in M/s Nitco Logistics Pvt. Ltd. and was posted in

CRM-M-31425-2016

branch office at Ludhiana. He was responsible for maintenance of regular accounts, smooth administration and running business on behalf of the company. As per the allegations, the complainant came to know that all the accused including the present petitioner had a criminal conspiracy with each other to embezzle the amount belonging to the company. They embezzled the huge amount of the company by criminal misappropriation; made false accounts and converted the money to their own use dishonestly as all the accused were involved in maintaining the accounts of the company. It is also mentioned in the FIR that the accused misappropriated the amount by manipulating the records as they were handling accounts of the company and they made false entries in respect of the freight amount received by them from different clients of the company.

Keeping in view the serious allegations levelled against the present petitioner and in view of the facts that the present petitioner is required for custodial interrogation and that the present petitioner as well as co-accused have written letters to the Managing Director of the said company admitting their involvement, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

21.09.2016

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No