

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

**CRM-M-21633-2017
Date of decision-03.07.2017**

**Sukhdev Singh and another
Vs.
State of Haryana**

...Petitioners

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. S.S.Mor, Advocate for the petitioners.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Criminal Procedure Code, the petitioners have sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.0792 dated 20.10.2016 registered under Sections 4 and 5 of Prize Chit and Money Circulation Scheme (Banning) Act, 1978 and Sections 406, 418 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC') at Police Station City Sirsa.

It is contended that the co-accused, namely, Madan Lal was the main person who allured the investors to make investment in the Prize Chits and Money Circulation Scheme headed by petitioner No.1 whereas, petitioner No.2 Inderpal Singh is an employee of Sukhchain Singh who had issued documents at the asking of co-accused Sukhdev Singh. It is asserted that the petitioners neither received any amount nor issued any receipt or FDR in favour of any investor. The co-accused Sukhdev Singh, who had allegedly issued receipts has been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 16.01.2017 in CRM-M-41816-2016.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the case file.

This is the second bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioners. The first bail application was dismissed by passing a detailed order dated 23.05.2017 (Annexure P-5). The petitioners instead of surrendering to the process of the Court have opted to file the present petition. The case of the present petitioners is not at par with co-accused Sukhdev Singh, who had himself made investment in the company and claimed to be the victim alongwith the complainant. The learned counsel for the petitioners has failed to point out any fresh favourable circumstance in favour of the petitioners. Keeping in view the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to accept the prayer made in the instant petition.

Dismissed.

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

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

July 03, 2017

vanita

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