

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

**CRM-M-4436-2017
Date of decision-23.05.2017**

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

**...Petitioners
...Respondent**

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

None for the complainant.

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.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.

The allegation against the petitioners is that they persuaded complainant-Jagdish to invest his funds with the company of which the petitioners were employees. Neither the petitioners received any amount nor issued any receipt thereagainst. The main accused is Sukhchain Singh. Co-accused, Sukhdev Singh, who allegedly issued receipts has been admitted to bail by this Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the co-accused, namely, Madan Lal is the main person who allured the investors to invest money in the Prize Chits and Money Circulation Circulation Scheme

headed by petitioner No.1 whereas petitioner No.2 Inderpal Singh is employee of Sukhchain Singh who issued documents at the asking of the Sukhdev Singh. Learned counsel further states that in-fact co-accused Sukhdev Singh is the main accused who received the amount for and on behalf of the company and did not deposit the same with the company.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that petitioners allured the complainant to invest in the company headed by Sukhchain Singh.

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

Considering the serious nature of allegations and active participation of the petitioners in the offence no case for grant of concession of anticipatory bail is made out. Otherwise also the context and nature of crime also disentitles the petitioners from the relief sought in the petition. This Court feels that it is a fit case where custodial interrogation of the petitioners are required to unearth the truth.

Dismissed.

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

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

May 23, 2017
vanita

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