

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

***CRM No.M-39824 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision:22.01.2016***

Manoj @ Sonu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present: Mr. Rajesh Khandelwal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Anmol Malik, AAG, Haryana.

.....

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

CRM No.M-39245 of 2015:

In view of the averments made in the application, prayer is allowed. Accordingly, Sections 465/467/468/471/120-B IPC read with Section 201 IPC are also inserted in the prayer clause of the present petition in addition to Section 420 IPC towards consideration of prayer of the petitioner seeking benefit of regular bail

Application is disposed of.

Main case:

This order shall dispose of the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.67 dated 08.02.2014 under Sections 406, 420, 465, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar, Bahadurgarh.

FIR in question was registered on the basis of a complaint made in the year 2012 of the Senior Manager, Union Bank of India, Ambala City. In the complaint it was alleged that in the months of June and July 2012, the bank had received 10 forged and fabricated cheques for Rs.50,000/- each

through State Bank of India, Allahabad Bank and Indian Overseas Bank. Complainant has stated that the cheques had neither been issued by the bank to any account holder nor printed on the leaves of the bank.

It so transpires that during the course of investigation, one Manoj S/o Ram Niwas was joined investigation and arrested on 09.10.2014. It is on the basis of disclosure statement of aforenoticed Manoj that the name of the present petitioner surfaced.

Learned State counsel has not been able to refer to any incriminating material/evidence which would be construed as direct evidence towards the present petitioner having forged and printed any cheques.

Investigation in the case is complete and challan has been presented and even charges have been framed on 02.01.2016.

Petitioner has been in custody since 14.10.2015.

Even though learned State counsel would submit that the petitioner is involved in yet another FIR but in such case petitioner has already been granted the concession of pre-arrest bail.

It has also gone controverted that co-accused Jasbir @ Rahul @ Amit has been granted the benefit of regular bail by this Court in terms of order dated 13.01.2016 in CRM No.M-43954 of 2015.

Without making any observations on merit, petitioner is held entitled to the benefit of bail.

Petition is allowed. Petitioner be enlarged on bail subject to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, Jhajjar.

Disposed of.

22.01.2016

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**