

(Through Video Conferencing)

CRM-M-15130-2020

Date of decision: 27.8.2020

Bunty @ Banti

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR**

Present: Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

**NIRMALJIT KAUR, J. (Oral)**

The present petition is filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.257 dated 27.5.2020 registered under Sections 408, 506 IPC, 1860 (Section 381 IPC added lateron), Police Station City Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.

Vide order dated 15.6.2020 while issuing notice of motion and staying the arrest of the petitioner, the contention of learned counsel that when petitioner demanded his salary from the complainant during the lock-down period due to pandemic COVID-19, the complainant concocted a false story and leveled false allegations against the petitioner were made. Further, no inventory of the sold articles has been prepared and no list of books was mentioned by the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he has joined investigation.

The allegation in the present FIR is that the petitioner who is working in Gurukirpa Steel Industries, Fatehabad was Incharge of the accounts of the factory. He collected cash amount of Rs.14,500/- on behalf

of the Gera Medical Fatehabad but did not deposit the same in the account of the factory. He also took Rs.5,000/- lying in the factory and thereafter sold the articles of the factory worth Rs.5,00,000/-.

The petitioner could not support his allegation that why it was only him out of all other employees of the factory against whom the case was registered just because he demanded the salary.

No doubt, the petitioner has joined the investigation but affidavit of Daljeet Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police City, Fatehabad, District Fatehabad has been filed stating therein the detail statement of the complainant under Section 161 Cr.P.C. wherein the complainant has given the detail of various articles sold by the petitioner and the amount embezzled. The petitioner may have joined the investigation but no recovery could be effected as he is not co-operating with the investigating agency under the protected shield of anticipatory bail.

It is not definitely case for extension of anticipatory bail. In view of the above, no ground for anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed accordingly.

**(NIRMALJIT KAUR)**  
**JUDGE**

**27.8.2020**  
sharmila

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether Speaking/Reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | : | Yes/No |