

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

CRM No.M-4314 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: August 29, 2018

Anil Johar @ Anil Kumar

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Partap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.B.S.Virk, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Amandeep Rana, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.301 dated 28.12.2017 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC, registered at Police Station Mullana, District Ambala.

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 has been registered after investigation conducted by the Economic Cell. As per the

allegations, present petitioner took ₹12 lakh from Dinesh Kumar complainant on the ground of providing government job placement. Learned counsel for the petitioner mainly relied upon a complaint made against SHO, Mullana to the Chief Minister etc.

From the perusal of the record, especially the police file, I find that there is cheque of ₹30,000/-, which the complainant's counsel argued, has been given by the present petitioner for refunding the amount partly. Even if it is taken that complaint was made against SHO by the present petitioner, even then, it is admitted fact that there is one another FIR against the present petitioner in which the petitioner is on regular bail and that FIR is also regarding cheating and forging documents.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, serious allegations against the petitioner and in view of the fact that FIR has been registered after the enquiry by Economic Cell, I find that petitioner is required for custodial interrogation and no ground is made out for granting anticipatory bail to him.

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

The order dated 02.02.2018 granting interim bail to the petitioner stands vacated.

August 29, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No