

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

110

**CRM-M-28043-2020 (O&M)
Date of Order:16.09.2020**

Vikram @ Vicky

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Gourav Mittal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of pre-arrest bail in a criminal case arising from FIR No.65, dated 05.03.2019, registered under Section 406/420 IPC and Section 3 of HR protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013, at Police Station Narwana City, District Jind (Haryana).

In a nutshell, the case of the prosecution has been noticed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, in paragraph 3 of its order dated 09.09.2020, which is extracted as under:-

“3. The present case FIR No.65 dated 5.3.2019 under Sections 420/406 IPC and Section 3 of the POIOD Act, 1997, Police Station City Narwana has been registered on the complaint of complainant Smt. Mafi w/o Angrej r/o Patel Nagar, Narwana, on the allegations that the applicant/petitioner along with his other associates has cheated the complainant, her family members and other co-villagers by inducing them to invest money in Vinayak Home Company and Rivet Trading Company on the assurance of giving maximum interest in minimum time and on their inducement they (complainant, her family members and other co-villagers) invested the money, whereas the said companies were already closed in the year 2015. They have also issued forged policies, receipts and bonds etc”.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is also victim of Veenayak Homes. He draws attention of the Court to Annexure P-3 in this regard. He contends that the petitioner has also invested a sum of Rs.10,000/-.

On the other hand, Sh. Chetan Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, has submitted that both the companies i.e. Veenakay Homes and Rivet Trading Company had already wound up and it is the petitioner, who had duped the first informant of his hard earned money.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and without commenting on merits, this court does not find it appropriate to grant concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

In the present case, in the considered view of this Court, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessary to unearth the truth.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has very fairly admitted that large number of complaints against Veenayak Homes and Rivet Trading Company are pending in the courts.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, Superintendent of Police, Jind, is directed to complete the investigation as expeditiously as possible preferably under his own supervision.

With these directions, the petition is disposed of.

September 16, 2020
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

: Yes/No
: Yes/No