

CRM-M-9364-2018

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

CRM-M-9364-2018

Date of Decision: 17.10.2018

Nirpender

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

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

Mr. Sharad Kumar Yadav, DAG, Haryana.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for brevity, 'Cr.P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.328 dated 09.08.2017, registered at Police Station Chandhut, District Palwal, under Sections 148, 149, 166-A, 408, 409 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 13 (2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

Notice of motion was issued in this petition. Learned State counsel has put in appearance 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 gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR, in the present case, has been registered on the application of Assistant Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Palwal. The allegations in the present FIR are against Shyam Sunder,

CRM-M-9364-2018

Salesman of PACS Gurwari and the present petitioner, who was also a Salesman of another Society. As per the allegations in the FIR, they embezzled the huge amount running into crores of rupees. It is mentioned in the impugned order dated 13.11.2017 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Palwal that a sum of more than ₹38.5 lakhs is shown to be credited in the account of the present petitioner and in the account of his wife, a sum of more than ₹29 lakhs is shown to be credited and a sum of more than ₹15 lakhs is shown to be credited in the account of his mother, Kartari and as such, a total sum of more than ₹83 lakhs is shown to have been credited.

Learned State counsel argued that the documents are still to be recovered from the present petitioner and he is required for custodial interrogation.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence and in view of the facts that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and that he is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

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

17.10.2018

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

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