

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

103

**CRM-M-27662-2020
Decided on : 14.09.2020**

Vijay Kumar

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

PRESENT: Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

Due to the outbreak of pandemic COVID-19, the instant case is being taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No. 435, dated 09.10.2019, under Sections 120-B, 406, 420 of IPC (later on added Sections 467, 468, 471 of IPC), registered at Police Station Panchkula, District Panchkula.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR in question nor was any role attributed to him in the said FIR. He further contends that the petitioner has been mistakenly arraigned as an accused, as his father's name is Ravi Kumar and not Anurag Kumar, as has come during the investigation by the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel on instructions has apprised this Court that the petitioner was an active participant in the crime in question, as he colluded with the co-accused. After a loan of Rs.46.24 lakhs was

fraudulently obtained by the co-accused Ravinder Singh in connivance with the accused Shobha, a transfer of Rs. 10.00 lakhs was made into the account of the petitioner. Learned State counsel has further apprised this Court that the petitioner has been operating with as many as 11 different identities and has also been giving different addresses at different points of time.

Learned State counsel while drawing the attention of this Court to the memo of parties, has submitted that the address given in the instant petition is different from the one given by the petitioner before the trial Court, when he moved an application under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail, as recently as on 01st September, 2020. He has, thus, contended that his custodial interrogation becomes imperative in the circumstances.

Heard.

Prima facie, there are serious allegations against the petitioner, for which his custodial interrogation would definitely be required. Therefore, no ground is made out to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

September 14, 2020

J.Ram

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