

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

CRM No.M-20848 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 06, 2018

Paramjit Singh Daim

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Kashish Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Surya Parkash, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.44 dated 15.05.2017 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC, registered at Police Station Mehna, District Moga.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petition.

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

From the record, I find that FIR in the present case has been got

Singh Group of College. As per the allegations, petitioner Paramjit Singh Daim was working in the college since 2007 on the post of Accountant. He used to accept the fees from the students of the college, maintain record and deposit the amount in the bank. On 21.04.2017, fee receipt of one student was checked, from where it has been found that Paramjit Singh Daim had issued receipt for a sum of ₹29,000/- to student Paramjit Kaur, whereas in college record, duplicate copy of that receipt has been given of ₹2000/-. The Management became suspicious and then on asking, the accused accepted his guilt and he made statement in writing that he had embezzled more than ₹30 lakhs in the record and also said that he will compensate for the same. It is also in the FIR that record of the college was also forged.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the fact that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner regarding embezzlement of amount of more than ₹30 lakhs and also regarding tampering of the record, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail. The petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

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

However, nothing stated above, shall constitute my opinion on merits of the case.

July 06, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No