

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

**CRM-M-268-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision-28.03.2017**

H.L.Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Amit Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

This petition under Section 438 of the Criminal Procedure Code has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.74 dated 12.05.2016 registered under Section 420 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code (in short IPC) and Sections 4 and 5 of Prize Chits & Money Circulation Schemes (Banning) Act, 1978 at Police Station Civil Lines, Bathinda, District Bathinda.

It is contended by learned counsel that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case being the father of accused Pardeep Kumar, who along with other co-accused had floated a chit fund company under the name of Perfect Realty and Credit Corporation Ltd. Bathinda. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged company.

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

The allegations in brief made in the complaint are that the petitioner along with other co-accused had formed a chit fund company in

2010 under the name of Perfect Realty and Credit Corporation Ltd. at Bathinda. The accused collected a huge amount from innocent persons on the pretext of providing more interest than the Banks. When the investors asked about their money, accused closed their offices. The accused even threatened them that they would be implicated in false complaints as the accused have tie ups with government officials. The accused have duped innocent persons of approximately Rs.10 crores.

Considering the serious nature of allegations and active involvement of the petitioner, this Court feels that it is a fit case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the truth. Otherwise also, the context and nature of crime disentitles the petitioner from the relief sought in the petition.

In the circumstances, no case for grant of concession of anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

Anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

March 28, 2017

vanita

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