

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

CRM-M-31956-2018

Date of Decision:30.07.2018

Snehpal

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present : Mr. Arvind Kumar Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI J. (Oral)

In the instant petition, petitioner has sought for anticipatory bail under the provisions of Section 438 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.311 dated 24.06.2018 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Dharuhera, District Rewari.

2. Allegation is that petitioner is stated to be helper at Pollution Centre which is situated near Shakti Hotel, National Highway No.8 Kharkhara Crossing near RTO Rajasthan. Such pollution centre is being run for the purpose of issuing pollution certificate to the owners of the vehicles whenever they approaches for issuance of Pollution Certificate. Such issuance of certificate is without there being a licence and so also necessary machinery. In other words, merely mentioning the registration certificate of the vehicle without any mechanical inspection, pollution certificate is being issued. Main accused has disclosed that petitioner is owner of the pollution centre who is resident of village Rai Malikpur tehsil Narnaul District Mahendergarh. These are the serious allegations against the petitioner to the extent that he and co-accused were duping the general public that too on two counts one is without machinery and second is without licence to run

the pollution centre. Even there is loss to Government revenue as no fee is being paid to the Government.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner was helper at Pollution Centre way back in the year 2011. He has been unnecessary implicated. He was not on the spot when the raid was conducted by the police officials.

4. The aforesaid submission cannot be taken into consideration for the reasons that accused who has been caught on the spot has disclosed the petitioner's name to the extent that he is owner and petitioner has not apprised what was the grudge of the co-accused to name the petitioner.

5. In view of these facts and circumstances, petitioner has not made out a case so as to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition stands dismissed.

30.07.2018
rajeev

(P.B. Bajanthri)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes/No**

Whether reportable **Yes/No**