IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-34074 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: October 26, 2018

Vikram Dhawan

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Kunal Dawar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Shashi Kumar Yadav, Advocate
for the complainant.

****

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.209 dated 15.07.2016 under Sections 420 and 406 IPC, registered at Police Station Sector17/18, Gurugram.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the 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, FIR in the present case has been got registered on the basis of the application that present petitioner is Director of Ozone City and Emerald Homes, Biwadi and he has taken

VINEET GULATI
2018.10.30 15:09
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh

application forms from the customers in the year 2012 with the promise to allot them plots/flats etc. but he has not done anything so far. The FIR has been registered in the year 2016.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been in custody for the last about two years. On the other hand, learned State counsel argued that after registration of the FIR, the petitioner had sold his major share in the company, which shows his intention to cheat so many people and to grab their money. Learned State counsel has brought to the notice of this Court that so many private witnesses are still to be examined. He also brought it to the notice of this Court that present petitioner has committed cheating of about ₹75 crores with hundreds of people as he has sold more than 1000 residential plots to the investors.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of the fact that there is every chance of tampering with the evidence, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of regular bail.

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

October 26, 2018 **(INDERJIT SINGH)**
Vgulati **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes**
Whether reportable **No**

VINEET GULATI
2018.10.30 15:09
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh