

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

CRM-M-42275 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision: 28.09.2016

Arjun Kumar Verma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Shalender Mohan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana
assisted by SI Dinesh Kumar.

Mr. Pawan Malik, Advocate for the complainant.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

CRM-36559-2015

Allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

Main Case

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.188, dated 27.03.2014, registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Sector-5, Gurgaon.

The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. Two FIRs

have already been registered against the petitioner on the same set of allegations. In earlier FIR dated 10.02.2014, the complainant was husband of the the present complainant. The petitioner had resigned from the complainant's husband firm in the year 2011 and the present FIR has been registered in the year 2014. In pursuance of the order dated 11.12.2014, the petitioner has repeatedly joined the investigation.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel submits that though the petitioner has joined investigation, however, he is not cooperating. He is involved in two other FIRs. The petitioner in connivance with his wife cheated the complainant by manipulating 60 cheques.

Heard.

Allegedly an amount of Rs. 18 lacs (approx.) was misappropriated while issuing around 60 cheques which were tampered by the petitioner. The amount has been credited in the account of the petitioner and his wife. The cheques in question were misused by the petitioner by forging the signatures of the authorized signatory i.e. the complainant. As per report of FSL, the specimen signatures of the petitioner has been matched with the signatures on the cheques in question. Keeping in view the allegations and the fraud committed, this Court feels that it is a fit case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessary to know his modus

operandi. Therefore, no case for anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

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

28.09.2016
sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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