

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

CRM-M No.39520 of 2016

Date of Decision: 07.02.2017

Satish

-Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

-Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. T.P.S. Tung, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.P. Chahar, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. S.S. Ghangas, Advocate,
for the complainant.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 437
dated 01.11.2013 under Sections 406, 420, 466, 468, 471,
120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City Sonapat, District
Sonapat.

The FIR was registered on the statement of Jai
Bhagwan. He alleged that one Pardeep is a good friend of the

complainant who is temporarily employed as a sweeper in MCD, Delhi. Pardeep is having good relations with the petitioner Satish. Proximity developed on account of said friendship between the accused and the complainant. The petitioner and his brother Shiv Kumar came to the house of Pardeep and told him that an amount of Rs.1.5 lac will be required for providing employment to each of the aspirants seeking employment in MCD, Delhi.

Allegations are that amount was paid to the petitioner, his brother Shiv Kumar, brother-in-law Santosh Handa, Sonu @ Vikas, Sudip Shukla and Rajinder Kumar Aggarwal. Fingerprints of all the persons aspiring to get appointments were taken in the house of Pardeep and they were even given ID number. In all, an amount of Rs.95 lacs was allegedly paid to the accused persons. Medical examinations of 22 candidates were also conducted by the accused persons in a dispensary at Shahdara, Delhi. When no employment was provided, the FIR came to be registered.

A compromise was allegedly arrived at between the parties wherein an amount of Rs.11 lac was returned by the petitioner and he also gave an undertaking on the stamp paper that he will return the balance amount of Rs.47 lacs within specified period.

Learned counsel for the petitioner by relying upon order dated 06.10.2014 submitted that the co-accused namely Santosh Handa and Sonu @ Vikas have already been granted regular bail by this Court in CRM-M-33307 of 2014 titled Santosh Handa and another vs State of Haryana. The case of the petitioner is not distinguishable from the said case.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Ranbir Singh submitted that challan has already been presented and the case is fixed for prosecution evidence.

In view of aforesaid, without meaning anything on the merits of the case, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed
to be an opinion on merits of the case.

07.02.2017

jyoti Y.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

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