

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33679-2016

Date of decision: October 24, 2016.

Harmandeep Singh

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Punjab

... **Respondent**

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI**

Present: Shri J.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral):

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

The petitioner is a government servant working in the Office of the Deputy Commissioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner has invited my attention to the First Information Report and the averments therein that the petitioner received money from various persons including his relations by stating that he was working in the office of Reader to the SDM. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is a family dispute and therefore, the allegations are made falsely by the close relatives of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that in the inquiry, it was found that there was no evidence that the money was given to the petitioner. But then, the complainant and the witnesses being related persons, it is found that it was necessary to have the evidence, oral statements and the verification of the bank account statements about

withdrawal of the amount etc. Thus, the petitioner does not deserve the grant of anticipatory bail having indulged in such type of serious offences misleading the close relatives and other persons in order to grab money from them by misrepresenting them. It does not behove of a government servant to act in such a manner. The petition is dismissed.

The Deputy Commissioner concerned is directed to conduct a departmental inquiry against the petitioner and take a decision thereupon within six months.

[A.B. Chaudhari]
Judge

October 24, 2016.
kadyan

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No