

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-26259 of 2018

Date of decision:20.7.2018

Samay Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. S.S. Dinarpur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr. B.S. Sewak, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.72 dated 28.5.2018 registered
for the offences under Sections 406, 420 and 506 IPC at Police Station
Barara, District Ambala.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, learned Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr.
B.S. Sewak, learned Advocate has appeared for the complainant and
contested this 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 the FIR in the present case has been registered on the basis of complaint filed by Pawan Kumar against Samay Singh-present petitioner and Satish Kumar co-accused. As per the allegations, the petitioner misappropriated an amount of ₹36 lakhs fraudulently in the name of allotment of gas agency and for hurling abuses and threats to eliminate. As per the allegations Satish Kumar co-accused came to the shop of the complainant and disclosed that he was Personal Secretary of one Samay Singh, who has been posted as officer in Tourism Department in Haryana Bhawan. He also told that Samay Singh is his relative and he would arrange complainant's meeting with Shyam Singh Rana, MLA in Haryana Bhawan through Samay Singh. There is allegation that demand of ₹46 lakhs was made and deal was struck for ₹36 lakhs, as per the complaint at a meeting with Samay Singh. The present petitioner is named in the FIR. Serious allegations of fraud have been alleged against him.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled for the grant of anticipatory bail.

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

July 20, 2018.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No