

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

CRM-M-18448-2020

Date of decision:30.7.2020

VAKIL AHMED

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. D.S. Matya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video
conferencing since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual
Court)*

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking grant of regular bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.45 dated 27.2.2018 under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 506 IPC at Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat.
2. The allegations are broadly to the effect that the petitioner along with co-accused Rakesh and Satinder had taken an amount of ₹5 lacs from the complainant and another 5 lacs from Kuldeep in the year 2014 while

holding out a representation that they could get them employed in some Government Department. However, the representation turned out to be false and they were never got employed. The matter was taken up before the '*Panchayat*' where the accused admitted their fraud and assured to return the amount and a cheque dated 28.7.2016 for an amount of ₹1,30,000/- was issued in favour of Kuldeep, which was signed by co-accused Rakesh (non-petitioner) but the same upon its presentation was dishonoured.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that it is a case where there was some monetary transaction between complainant and the accused and that a false FIR has been lodged against the petitioner and others. It has further been submitted that in any case the investigation has concluded and '*Challan*' stands presented, and in these circumstances no useful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner behind bars, who has been in custody since last about 5 months.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that since there are specific allegations against the petitioner to the effect that he had defrauded the complainant and one Kuldeep, no case for grant of bail is made out. It has further been submitted that since the two other co-accused have been declared proclaimed offender, there is every likelihood that the petitioner may also abscond, if granted bail.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Bearing in mind the nature of allegations and the fact that the '*Challan*' already stands presented, further detention of the petitioner will not serve

any useful purpose as conclusion of trial is likely to take some time.

7. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

30.7.2020
Gaurav Sorot

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking? Yes / No

Whether reportable? Yes / No