

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No. 217

CRM-M-6193-2017

Decided on : 01.03.2017

Aman Goyal

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Ms. Dhivya Jerath, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

. . .

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition, filed under Section 439 Cr. P. C., the petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No. 807, dated 12.11.2016, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Central Faridabad, District Faridabad.

The allegations against the petitioner are that to avoid payment of late fee, he had filled up a wrong date in the application form filed by him for registration of his vehicle.

Seeking regular bail for the petitioner, learned counsel submits that no application was submitted by the petitioner for registration of his vehicle as for doing the needful he had deputed some other person and as and when the petitioner came to know with regard to filling up of a wrong date in the afore-referred application form, not only did he immediately deposit an amount of Rs. 2,12,800/- in the Government Treasury which was the amount payable as late fee, he also got lodged an FIR against the person whom he had deputed to file the afore-referred application. She further submits that the petitioner has joined investigation and being in judicial custody is no longer needed for further questioning.

Learned State counsel opposes the bail application on the ground that the petitioner had committed forgery and that there was another FIR pending against him under Section 420 IPC which was arising out of an agreement to sell allegedly entered into by him.

The role of the petitioner would be only deciphered during the trial which has not yet even begun and thus, is unlikely to conclude in the near future. Admittedly, the petitioner has deposited the late fee which was payable by him. He is further no longer needed for investigation purposes.

In view of the above, I am of the opinion that the petitioner deserves to be admitted to regular bail.

Bail to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, Faridabad.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

While on bail if the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal activity/misusing the concession of bail, it will be open to the State to move an appropriate application before the competent court/this court for cancellation of the granted bail to the petitioner through this order.

01.03.2017
shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE