

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

**CRM No.M-42249 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: January 22, 2019**

Rajiv Kumar Chug

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Sanjiv Kumar Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Munish Kumar Garg, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.378 dated 10.07.2018 under Sections 406, 420 and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonipat.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 appeared and contested the petition.

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

The perusal of the record shows that on 17.11.2018, learned counsel for the petitioner produced the schedule of repayment to the

complainant i.e. M/s Krishan Lal Jitender Kumar, which was taken on record. It is stated on that day that the petitioner would adhere to the schedule and in view of the schedule of repayment, an amount of ₹10 lakhs has also been transferred in the account of the complainant by way of RTGS. A detailed schedule has been mentioned in the order.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has brought it to the notice of this Court earlier on 15.01.2019 and today also, that the petitioner has not adhered to the schedule of the repayment and has not paid money as per undertaking given by him. The perusal of the FIR also shows that the petitioner is the main accused and all the substantive allegations are levelled against him.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and in view of conduct of the petitioner that he is not complying with his undertaking given before this Court regarding schedule of the repayment, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of regular bail.

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

January 22, 2019
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No