

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20096-2019

Date of Decision: 20.05.2019

Raman Kumar Garg

.... Petitioner

Versus

Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: - Mr. Jagmohan Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Lokesh Narang, Advocate for respondent.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., petitioner-Raman Kumar Garg, has prayed for grant of regular bail in Complaint No. 03 dated 07.12.2018 titled as “Assistant Director Vs. Rajeev Mehan and others”, under Sections 3 and 4 of the Prevention of the Money Laundering Act, 2002.

According to the prosecution, the petitioner along with his co-accused, fictitiously and falsely claimed VAT refund worth ₹74,36,067/- on forged and fabricated papers showing export of goods to the foreign countries. However, on investigation the petitioner admitted receipt of ₹ 44,00,000/- in M/s Jaldhara Cotspin Pvt. Ltd., through his father-Vinod Kumar Garg, who is still at large for the last more than 5 months.

Learned counsel *inter alia* contends that petitioner is in custody since 12.03.2019. Property of grandmother of the petitioner in Ludhiana, worth ₹5-6 crores against the aforesaid VAT refund, has already been attached by the respondent-complainant. Recovery, if any, of the alleged VAT refund can easily be effected by the respondent-complainant from the aforesaid attached property. Conclusion of trial may take sufficient long time. Therefore, keeping the petitioner any more in jail would not serve any purpose. It is prayed that petitioner may be released on bail, on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, besides an undertaking that he would appear on each and every date during trial.

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent-complainant vehemently opposing the above submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner is booked in three more cases of similar nature in which investigation is pending. In case, petitioner is released on bail, he will create hurdle in the trial. Therefore, he may not be enlarged on bail. Vinod Kumar Garg, father of the petitioner is still at large for the last more than 5 months.

Having given thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions and the fact that recovery of alleged VAT refund allegedly obtained by the petitioner can be effected from his attached property and further that conclusion of trial may take sufficient long time, this Court feels it appropriate to grant bail to the petitioner pending trial, on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds as well as the undertaking aforesaid to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

That apart, the petitioner shall surrender his passport with the trial Court and shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court concerned/trial Court.

May 20, 2019
rishu

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No