

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

CRM-M-13440-2020 (O&M)

Date of decision : 15.07.2020

Parveen Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Rishi Pal, Advocate for
Mr. Rajesh Nain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, D.A.G., Haryana.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing in the light of the pandemic COVID-19 situation and as per instructions.

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 548 dated 17.06.2019, registered under Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') (Sections 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC added later on) at Police Station City Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that co-accused Nidhi Sharma and Nikhil Sharma have been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court on 10.09.2019 and 26.11.2019 respectively. The allegations contained in the FIR are totally false and do not constitute any offence against the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner is the main accused in this case, who committed fraud with the Bank. The cases of the co-accused, namely, Nidhi Sharma and Nikhil Sharma are not at par with the case of the petitioner as he is the master mind.

Heard.

On a specific query made by the Court that whether the petitioner is ready to clear all the liability, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner stated that he has no instructions in this regard. The petitioner prima facie with intention to cheat the bank obtained loan of ₹30 lakh allegedly for purchasing the house. The Court feels that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary in the circumstances.

Therefore, no case for grant of relief sought is made out, at this stage.

Dismissed.

However, nothing noticed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

15.07.2020
Jyoti-II

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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