

206-A

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-41145-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 09.03.2018

Yadvinder Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. K.B.S. Mann, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Vide order dated 29.11.2016, the following directions were issued: -

“The petitioner is alleged to have duped complainant Sushil Kumar and other victims for a sum of Rs.26 lacs along with his other associates on the pretext that they would be sent to Canada. The petitioner and his co-accused neither sent them abroad nor returned the amount.

With the assistance of State counsel, I have gone through the police file, which indicates that the petitioner had received a sum of Rs.3 lacs, 5 lacs, 3 lacs, 9 lacs and 2 lacs from Sube Singh, Sushil Karam Singh, Satpal, Ishwar and Shiv Charan, respectively, total amount to Rs. 26 lacs. The petitioner is liable along with his co-accused for the said amount. On asking of the court, counsel for the petitioner submits that without admitting the liability, the petitioner can deposit some security for the victims. He has undertaken to pay

a sum of Rs.5/6 lacs subject to final adjudication of the matter, without admitting the guilt.

Counsel for the petitioner will seek instructions if the petitioner can deposit bank drafts of Rs. 1 lac, Rs. 1 lac, Rs. 1 lac, Rs.2 lacs, Rs. 1 lac and Rs. 1 lac in favour of Sube Singh, Sushil, Karam Singh, Satpal, Ishwar and Shiv Charan, respectively, without prejudice to his rights.

Adjourned to 21.12.2016.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Krishan Kumar, submits that in compliance of the order dated 29.11.2016, till date petitioner Yadvinder Singh has not deposited the amount of Rs.1 lac each in favour of the complainants and is also not appearing before the trial Court.

In view of the above and since the petitioner is misusing the concession of interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 21.12.2016, present petition praying for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is dismissed. It is clarified that the order dated 21.12.2016, vide which the interim bail was granted to the petitioner is also vacated.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

09.03.2018

vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No