

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

**CRM-M-52762-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 13.01.2020**

Shavinder Pal Singh Petitioner
Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present : Mr. J.S.Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (Oral)

Through this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail in a case arising from FIR No.164 dated 14.04.2018, registered under Sections 406, 408, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Baldev Nagar, District Ambala, Haryana.

According to prosecution, petitioner as an employee of complainant company namely E-pay Enforcement Private Ltd., embezzled an amount of ₹54,00,000/-, who was engaged for collecting electricity bills from the consumers of Uttar Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam.

Learned counsel relying upon the orders dated **14.09.2018 in CRM-M-19535-2018 (Giri Raj vs. State of Haryana)** and **19.12.2018 in CRM-M-29702-2018 (Vinod Kumar vs. State of**

Haryana) of the Co-ordinate Bench, contends that the petitioner is in custody since last more than 1 ½ years. Conclusion of trial may take a sufficient long time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any more in jail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for complainant vehemently opposing the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, urged that he has committed fraud of huge amount of Rs.54,00,000/- with complainant company. Fresh charges have been framed against the petitioner on 03.01.2020.

Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case and taking into account the criminal breach of trust and fraud to the tune of Rs.54,00,000/- committed by the petitioner with his employer, this Court is not inclined to entertain this application.

The facts and circumstances of the authority, referred to above, by the learned counsel for petitioner are not identical to the facts of the present case. Therefore, the benefit of same cannot be given to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

13.01.2020
mamta

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No