

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

**CRM-M No.41411 of 2017
Date of Decision : 14.02.2018**

Parveen Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Dy. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)

Ld. Counsel for the State in response to the query in the last order has explained that the complainant in this case came to know about the fraud allegedly committed by the petitioner after the judgment in MACT Case No.75 on 9.07.2013/25.09.2013 was passed by the MACT Gurgaon on 21st January, 2015, only after which he could learn that the money paid by him towards insurance premium was not deposited by the petitioner, which resulted in the complainant who was proprietor of the Firm (respondent No.2) in the MACT case, to be saddled with huge liabilities. The FIR in question was lodged on 27th of January,

which was only 06 days after that said judgment was passed. As such the apparent delay of two years in lodging the FIR has been explained, which in the given facts and circumstances does appear to be satisfactory.

For these reasons and in view of the fact that no steps are being taken on behalf of the petitioner today, the present application for regular bail is dismissed.

February 14, 2018

Dpr

**(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No