

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

CRM No.M-28220 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 12, 2018

Joginder Singh alias Gindi

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.B.S.Virk, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.543 dated 25.08.2017 under Sections 409 and 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Sonapat City, District Sonapat.

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 FIR in the present case has been registered on the application of complainant Jai Bhagwan. As per the allegations, the accused persons came with proposal to deposit amount in

saving accounts in FD, RD, MIS with GAIB Village Development Credit Co-operative Society, Gohana. Accused persons induced and called the complainant for meeting, where already 200-300 persons were present. The accused persons allured all the persons including complainant to deposit amount in their saving account, FD, RD, MIS, on which, they started to deposit amount and timely paid installments. When the persons, whose amounts were matured for payment went to the office of the Society, then they felt suspicion. Then those applicants themselves investigated about the society and came to know that society is based on forged documents and it is neither valid nor recognized by the State of Haryana. It is further stated that applicants repeatedly asked the culprits for payment of maturity amount but all the defaulters did not pay any amount and they absconded one by one from their office.

The present petitioner is named in the FIR and has been stated as Zonal Manager. The plea of the petitioner is that he has already resigned before the registration of the FIR. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contended that petitioner was only employee of the society and is not a beneficiary.

Learned State counsel contended that as per documents, collected during investigation, present petitioner has been shown as Director of the Society. I have also gone through the police record, in which, documents show the petitioner as Director.

Keeping in view the serious allegations against the petitioner regarding committing big fraud with hundreds of people and without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on

the merits of the case, I find that petitioner is required for custodial

interrogation and no ground is made out for granting anticipatory bail to him.

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 12, 2018	(INDERJIT SINGH)
Vgulati	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No