

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

215

CRM-M-14735 of 2017

Date of Decision: May 05, 2017

Khazan Singh

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. S.P. Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Aman Dhir, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satish Saini, DAG, Haryana.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.186 dated 26.03.2017, under Sections 120-B, 201 of Indian Penal Code & Sections 12/13/17 of Prevention of Corruption Act and Section 19 of Punjab Land Preservation Act, registered at Police Station Palam Vihar, Gurugram.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

Briefly it may be noticed that a company by the name of M/s M3M India Pvt. Ltd. had applied for felling/transplantation of 20 trees in the area of Village Chome, District Gurugram and vide order dated 24.01.2017, the competent authority under the authorized department had granted such permission.

Allegations are that in contravention of such permission, the company has carried out illegal felling of 1322 trees as also 921 undersized trees.

Enquiry in the matter having been conducted by a team

of 2 Range Forest Officers revealed the connivance of certain forest officials in such illegal act.

Apparently, an enquiry was also got conducted at the hands of Deputy Conservator of Forest, Gurugram on the directions of Conservator of forest, South Circle and it is during the course of such enquiry that the complicity of the present petitioner, serving as Block Forest Officer in the area, in question has come forth.

Precise allegations are that a deal has been struck for a sum of ₹4,00,000(four lacs) between the private company as also the forest guard Parveen and the illegal felling of trees was overlooked by the present petitioner who was in-connivance and in-conspiracy with the other co-accused.

The allegations contained in the FIR are serious in nature.

It is a matter which would require a deep and thorough probe and which may well warrant even custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

Under such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the order dated 20.04.2017, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram (Annexure P-17) while declining the concession of anticipatory bail.

Petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

05.05.2017
anju rani

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