

CRM-M-6019-2017

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

CRM-M-6019-2017

Date of Decision: 23.02.2017

Gaurav Goyal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner-Gaurav Goyal has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.206 dated 13.06.2015, registered at Police Station Sector 5, Panchkula, under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

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

From the record, I find that FIR has been registered against the present petitioner, his wife- Nitu Goyal and other co-accused on the basis of written complaint. As per the allegations, Nitu Goyal wife of the present petitioner obtained the loan-credit facility of ₹80 lakhs from the bank and the petitioner alongwith others stood guarantor and mortgaged the property measuring 8 marls 3 sarsahi and they had shown themselves to be owners in

CRM-M-6019-2017

possession of this specific property and had also placed on record photographs of the same. The valuer also valued the property, which was shown in the photographs, as Rs.50 lakhs. Later on, when the loanee committed default, then on verification, it was found that the property shown in the photographs and as mentioned in the valuation report was not found on the spot. Halqa Patwari also stated that the said mortgaged properties at villages Pabhat, Tehsil Derabassi and Bitna, Kalka have not been located and the khasra numbers as mentioned in the sale deed are located somewhere else differently from the area which the accused had shown themselves to be owners in possession as well as from the description and photographs given in the valuation report.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of the fact that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

23.02.2017

parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

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