

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-24990 of 2016

.....

Date of decision:30.7.2018

Jarnail Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

....

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh**

.....

Present: Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

.....

**Inderjit Singh, J.**

Petitioner Jarnail Singh has filed this petition under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. for cancellation of bail granted to accused-respondents No.2 to 4 by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, vide order dated 9.5.2018 (Annexure-P.2) in case FIR No.130 dated 19.4.2018 for the offences under Sections 420, 406 and 120-B IPC and Section 3 of the Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in F.E. Act, 2013 registered at Police Station Bhupani, District Faridabad.

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

From the record, I find that the FIR was registered on the basis of written complaint submitted by the complainant/present petitioner Jarnail Singh. As per the allegations, the accused knew the complainant/petitioner and they approached the complainant/petitioner to invest the money. As per allegations ₹50 lakhs were given by the petitioner and the rate of interest

was settled at 24% on the above said amount. ₹40 lakhs were paid through cheque and ₹10 lakhs were paid in cash. The cheques issued by respondents No.2 to 4 were bounced. On the basis of these facts, the learned Additional Sessions Judge granted anticipatory bail to respondents No.2 to 4 vide order dated 9.5.2018 (Annexure-P.2).

Learned counsel for the petitioner at the time of arguments has not argued that respondents No.2 to 4 have misused the concession of anticipatory bail. He neither argued that they attempted to tamper with the evidence nor anything was argued that any condition of bail has been violated. The only argument is that in view of the seriousness of the offences the anticipatory bail should not have been granted by the learned Additional Sessions Judge. A perusal of the record shows that FIR is only for the offences under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC.

In the facts and circumstances of the present case; without discussing the facts in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find that no illegality has been committed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge while granting anticipatory bail to respondents No.2 to 4.

There is no reason or ground to cancel the bail granted to respondents No.2 to 4. Therefore, finding no merit in this petition, the same is dismissed.

July 30, 2018.

**(Inderjit Singh)**  
**Judge**

\*hsp\*

|              |                            |     |
|--------------|----------------------------|-----|
| <b>NOTE:</b> | Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes |
|              | Whether reportable:        | No  |