

204

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

**CRM-M No.22717 of 2017
Date of Decision: 19.01.2018**

Rakesh Kumar Srivastava

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

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

Mr. Munish Dev Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.427 dated 16.11.2016 registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station Ambala Cantt.

FIR was registered at the instance of Suman Lata wife of Vijender Singh with the allegations that she was working as an agent in RDPL Company since 2012. Owner and CMD of this company was Parveen Kumar Rohilla who had changed the name of the company on two occasions and ultimately, name of

the company was changed to Max Multi Purpose Company. Allegations have been made that some of the persons deposited amounts with the Company and Parveen Kumar Rohilla did not make payment of the amount on maturity. Petitioner was General Manager of the Company and had resigned on 05.08.2015. Thereafter, he filed complaint to S.H.O, Narela, New Delhi against Parveen Kumar Rohilla.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that no amount was ever entrusted to the petitioner. Challan has already been presented. Petitioner was arrested on 06.05.2017. Bail was declined by the Court of Sessions only on the premise that the main accused was at large at that time. Now the main accused has already been arrested.

Learned State Counsel on instructions from SI Satish Kumar submitted that though the challan has been presented against the petitioner and the main accused has already been arrested, but one of the co-accused i.e. Cashier has not been arrested so far.

Keeping in view the stage of the case, particularly when challan has already been presented, petitioner is in custody since 06.05.2017, trial being a Magistrate trial and without meaning anything on the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail, subject to

his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

January 19, 2018.

Prince

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No