

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-51170 of 2018

.....

Date of decision:17.12.2018

Nadeem Siddiqui

...Petitioner

v.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Sarfraj Hussain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana of the
respondent-State

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.349 dated 23.11.2017
registered for the offences under Sections 420, 166, 167, 384, 465, 467, 468,
471, 120-B IPC and Sections 7, 8, 10, 12, 13(1) (d) (e) and 15 of the
Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 at Police Station Shivaji Nagar,
Gurugram.

Notice of motion was issued in this case.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, learned Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana has appeared on behalf of the respondent-State and contested this
petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as
learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the present

[2]

petitioner was posted as Clerk in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Nuh and he is not named in the FIR. Only one file relating to RC of the complainant has been recovered from his house.

On the other hand, learned State counsel argued that the present petitioner is required for custodial interrogation. He argued that when the petitioner joined the investigation, he admitted that he remained posted in the office of RTA also and is a Computer Operator. The learned State counsel has shown the documents that so many driving licences, registration certificates etc. have been recovered from his house.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the fact that some driving licences, RCA etc. have been issued or renewed with the connivance of the officials of the RTA office and in view of the allegations in the FIR and the fact that recoveries of so many driving licences, RCs etc. have been effected from his house, he is required for custodial interrogation. Therefore, in view of the nature and gravity of the offences and the allegations against the present petitioner, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail. Hence, no ground is made out for grant of anticipatory bail.

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

December 17, 2018.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No