

1)	Date of Decision: March 29, 2017 Crl. Misc. No.M-9538 of 2017 (O&M)	
Jaswant Rai	Versus	...Petitioner
State of Punjab and another		...Respondents
2)	Crl. Misc. No.M-9554 of 2017 (O&M)	
Jaswant Rai	Versus	...Petitioner
State of Punjab		...Respondent

Present:- Mr. J.P. Rana, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. K.S. Pannu, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate, for the complainant,

Pursuant to the order dated 22.03.2017, impleading the Punjab Agro Food Corporation Limited, through its Managing Director as respondent no.2, with notice issued to the added respondent, Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate, appears for the said Corporation and submits that as a matter of fact, no allegation other than negligence in exercising his supervisory duties was made against the petitioner by the Corporation, which is the complainant in the FIR. The primary allegation of embezzlement was against one Pawanpreet Singh, who was the Plinth Incharge, with the petitioner being the District Manager of the Corporation, who has been chargesheeted by way of departmental proceedings for negligence in supervisory duties.

Vikas Chander
2017.03.30 18:20
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Singh, Police Station Bhikhwind, however submits that during the course of investigation, on a disclosure statement made by the co-accused of the petitioner, the investigating agency is of the opinion that the embezzlement being to the tune of Rs.11 crores (approximately), it could not have been done simply by one person who was the Plinth Manager, without active connivance with other officials, one of whom, it is alleged, is the petitioner.

On a specific query as to whether custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required, learned State counsel, on instructions from the police official who is present in Court to assist him, submits that gate passes etc. are still to be recovered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner having retired, obviously no record would be available with him.

Keeping in view the fact that no recovery is to be made from the petitioner at this stage, however, without making any comment on the merits of the allegation against him on either side, i.e. in his defence or against him, the order dated 22.03.2017, granting interim bail to the petitioner in both the petitions, is made absolute on the same terms and conditions.

The petitions are disposed of accordingly.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

March 29, 2017
vcgarg

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: no