

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

CRM-M No. 684 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : July 22, 2016

Harpreet Singh,

..... Petitioner

v.

Union Territory, Chandigarh

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. SS Swaich, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. AS Virk, APP for UT Chandigarh.

Mr. Arshdep Singh Bhullar, Advocate
for the complainant.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?**
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?**

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in case FIR No.70,

dated 20.2.2014, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of

the IPC, at Police Station Sector 17, UT Chandigarh.

On the last date, the following order was passed :-

“ The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail. After detailed arguments, the controversy has been narrowed down. Counsel for the complainant has argued that the petitioner is guilty of having defalcation of more than ₹ 2 crores and in case he is released on bail there is possibility that he may abscond. If the petitioner is willing to secure the amount, he would not oppose the bail.

Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is the owner of a plot of about 4 kanals in Ambala City, value of which is stated to be not less than 1.5 crore and that the petitioner would be willing to offer that as a security for grant of bail. He has handed over a copy of the transfer deed to counsel for the complainant to verify the facts.

Adjourned to 22.7.2016.”

Today, counsel for the complainant has stated that the assertion that the value of the property of the petitioner in Ambala is worth ₹ 1.5 crore is incorrect, because that property is at village Nasirpur and its value is much lesser. Apart from that, the petitioner has property at villages Tundla, Tehsil and District Ambala and Batouli, Tehsil Derabassi, District SAS Nagar, and that in case the petitioner is willing to offer those properties (subject to whatever pre-existing charge which any of them may have), he would not oppose the grant of regular bail.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that he is not in a

position to confirm or deny the ownership of the properties at villages Tundla and Batouli but in case this is correct, the petitioner would be ready to offer these properties also as surety.

In view of this statement, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner be released on bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court subject to his offering the properties at villages Nasirpur, Tundla and Batouli as surety, if he owns the same, subject to any pre-existing charge which may be attached to any of these properties.

July 22, 2016
'kk'

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE