

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

CRM No.M-6101 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 27, 2018

Sajjan Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Ajay Kumar Kansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.543 dated 25.08.2017 under Sections 409 and 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Sonapat City, District Sonapat.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

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

From the record, I find that complainant Jai Bhagwan filed an application for registration of a case against present petitioner and other co-accused. As per the allegations, the accused persons came with proposal to

deposit amount in saving accounts in FD, RD, MIS with GAIB Village Development Credit Co-operative Society, Gohana. Accused persons induced and called the complainant for meeting, where already 200-300 persons were present. The accused persons allured all the persons including complainant to deposit amount in their saving account, FD, RD, MIS, on which, they started to deposit amount and timely paid installments. When the amounts were matured for payment, the office of the Society was contacted for payment. They felt suspicion and by investigating, came to know that society is based on forged documents and it is neither valid nor recognized by the State of Haryana. The amount was not paid and accused absconded one by one.

The present petitioner is named in the FIR. He is stated to be Area Manager.

Keeping in view the serious allegations against the petitioner, who is named in the FIR and without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, 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.

July 27, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No