

CRM-M-38363 of 2019

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

CRM-M-38363 of 2019
Date of Decision: 21.01.2020

Jasmeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present:- Mr. Tejinderbir Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Rohit Aggarwal, Advocate, for the complainant.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel has filed vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant on his own, though he has not been impleaded as party. The same is taken on record. Be tagged at appropriate place.

Through this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner – Jasmeet Singh in case FIR No.910 dated 25.12.2018 registered under Sections 408, 201, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station Sadar, Gurugram.

According to the prosecution, petitioner, working as a Regional Sales Manager in Royal Enfield, along with his co-accused committed fraud of several lakhs of rupees, preparing forged and false invoices in the name of organising service camps through Royal Enfield dealers.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that petitioner has falsely been implicated. He is not named in the FIR.

CRM-M-38363 of 2019

Petitioner did not receive any amount. While leaving service, complainant company issued him 'No Objection Certificate'.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, submits that petitioner by forging and fabricating invoices, giving mobile number of his wife on the same, has cheated and defrauded his employer company for several lakhs of rupees. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to know as to how many fake invoices, he issued to different people. Petitioner even while leaving job of the complainant company, admitted his guilt in writing. Petitioner was never given clean chit by his employer company, rather vide Annexure P-2 asked him to clear his dues.

Heard.

Considering overall facts and circumstances, petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail. This Court is of the firm view that he is required for custodial interrogation.

Dismissed.

January 21, 2020
R.S.

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No