

CRM-M-1130-2019

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

CRM-M-1130-2019

Date of Decision: 17.01.2019

Anish Ahmed

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Satish Chaudhary, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, AAG, Haryana.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 211 dated 03.06.2017, registered at Police Station Tauru, District Nuh, under Sections 379-A and 420 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Notice of motion has been issued. Learned State counsel has appeared and contested the instant 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 as per the case of prosecution, complainant-Raj Luxmi Manda was contacted by one Sagar Pandit for starting a business. He stated that if the complainant needs vehicle, he

CRM-M-1130-2019

would provide him at cheap rate. Thereafter, the complainant deposited ₹10,000/- in the account of Sagar Pandit, who told him to come to his office once. On 02.06.2017, when the complainant reached Delhi from Chennai in Indigo Flight.

The complainant was also accompanied by one Sheel Kumar Rai. When they boarded the car, Anish stopped the vehicle near _____ two

Learned State counsel has brought to the notice of this Court that during investigation, it has come that the present petitioner had phoned the complainant in the name of Sagar Pandit and he is one of the accused. Learned State counsel has also submitted that there is one more case pending against the present petitioner. She also submitted that statement of another witness namely Sheel Kumar Rai is yet to be recorded.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence and in view of the fact that there is every chance of tampering with the evidence, if the petitioner is released on bail, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of regular bail.

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

17.01.2019
parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No