

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.105

CRM-M-7689-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision : 20.2.2019

Randhir Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.21 dated 27.1.2019, registered at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula, under Sections 120-B, 188, 420 IPC and Section 7 of Specified Bank Notes (Cessation of Liabilities) Act, 2017.

The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement of one Vikramjeet Tangri. Accordingly, a naka was established and a Brezza car was stopped. From the said car, recovery of Rs.71 lakhs in demonetized currency was effected. The persons who was arrested at the spot disclosed that the currency belongs to the petitioner. The car is also owned by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a Granthi earning Rs.15,000/- per month and he has no resources for collecting such a huge amount of demonetized currency. The co-accused have framed him because the car was owned by him. The car was taken by one Amit Kumar, who in connivance with the persons arrested at the spot have misused the same. Thus, the petitioner has falsely implicated and he deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

It is a fact that the car from which the recovery was effected is owned by the petitioner. His averment that the same was taken by one Amit Kumar and was misused by him cannot be accepted on face value as there is no complaint/FIR against the said Amit Kumar. Further, a video recording has recovered from the persons who were arrested at the spot and in the said video recording a huge amount of demonetized currency is shown to have been stored in a room allegedly belonging to the petitioner. It has also transpired that the petitioner owns property which is not commensurate with him alleged source of income Rs.15,000/- per month. Thus, it cannot be held that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. In the facts and circumstances of this case, he deserves no relief.

The petition is accordingly, dismissed.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

20.2.2019

Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes/ No