

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

CRM No.M-31276 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 25, 2018

Arun Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Sanchit Punia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.25 dated 12.01.2018 under Sections 379, 420 IPC and Section 66 of the I.T. Act, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar.

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

From the record, I find that FIR in the present case has been registered on the application of Rajiv Sehrawat, who stated that on 12.01.2018, at about 4.30 p.m., a telephonic call was received at his house that from the bank account of his wife, an amount of ₹12,100/- and from his company's bank account, amount of ₹1,82,712/- has been withdrawn. After some time, from the complainant's bank account, ₹1,90,727/- has been

Withdrawn. In this way, total amount of ₹3,73,439/- has been transferred to

another account given in the FIR, which was of Union Bank of India. After that, from A/M account, an amount of ₹1,90,000/- and ₹10,000/- from Axis Bank, Lanka Branch, Banaras, has been transferred. As per the record, a substantial amount has been deposited, after withdrawing from the account of the complainant, in the account of wife of the present petitioner.

As per the investigation, present petitioner has committed the offence by withdrawing the amount. As per order dated 14.06.2018 passed by learned Court of Session, there are serious allegations against the accused (present petitioner) that he has fraudulently got transferred huge amount from the bank account of complainant etc., in the account of his wife.

Keeping in view the allegations against the petitioner and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details 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 grant of benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

July 25, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No