

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

**CRM No.M-21518 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: October 05, 2018**

Ram Pal

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Keshav Pratap Singh Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.789 dated 01.10.2014 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Karnal.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

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

From the record, I find that, in the present case, FIR has been got registered by Haryana State Coop. Supply & Marketing Federation Ltd. (HAFED). As per the FIR, petitioner Rampal is owner of M/s Dharti Putra

Export, Taraori, who has caused financial loss to HAFED by committing

fraud, forgery, cheating, breach of trust and violation of clause 10 of Haryana Rice Procurement (Levy) Order 1985. It is stated that paddy procured in the year 2012-13 has been given to miller for custom milling of paddy and miller was required to deliver custom milled rice to FCI, which period was extended from time to time but the accused did not deliver paddy. Present petitioner submitted two cheques of ₹40 lakhs and ₹80 lakhs and FDRs of ₹6 lakhs and ₹1 lakh. The cheques were bounced and FDRs are stated to be scanned FDRs. Now, ₹6,87,85,887/- is recoverable from the petitioner. It is also in the FIR that M/s Dharti Putra Export had given cheque of ₹2.15 crore and the same was also bounced and the petitioner given other cheques, which were also bounced.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, nature and gravity of the offence and in view of the fact that case is at preliminary stage and there is every chance of tampering with the evidence, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of regular bail.

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

As the petitioner is on interim bail, he is directed to surrender himself before learned trial Court within 15 days from today and if the petitioner did not surrender, then learned trial Court will take appropriate action, as per law.

October 05, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No