

\$~1

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1922/2020 & CrI. M.As. 10028-29/2020**

**NARAYAN PANWAR**

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Ruchi Gupta, Adv.

versus

**STATE OF NCT OF DELHI**

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State with  
SI Sanjeev and Mr. C.R. Radha  
(Manager Indian Bank)

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA**

**ORDER**

%

**28.07.2020**

**(Video Conference Hearing)**

This is an application seeking anticipatory bail. Applicant is specifically named in the FIR for his role of alleged embezzlement of the amounts lying in different accounts of the customers of the bank where he was employed at the relevant time as a clerk and single window operator of the accounts.

Ms. Gupta, ld. counsel for the applicant strenuously contends that there is delay in the registration of the FIR inasmuch as the alleged incidents of embezzlement attributable to the applicant are of the year 2015-17 and

the FIR is made after his transfer from the subject branch to Bhopal besides the transfer of the Assistant Manager concerned. Ms. Gupta further strenuously contends that for the alleged acts of embezzlement, the applicant would have utilized the terminals/systems of the bank only and thereby, no recovery of any Laptop, mobile phone etc. is even required to be effected from the applicant.

Having given thoughtful consideration to the contentions of Ms. Gupta, Id. counsel for the applicant, the court does not find any reason to grant the anticipatory bail application. Suffice it would be to say, the applicant is specifically named for his role and it is not in question that the applicant was the single window operator at the relevant time and thereby, directly connected with the subject accounts for which the embezzlement is allegedly attributed to him. Then, any act of fraud invites action, when detected. In this case too, the bank is said to have initiated action in such circumstances only. Similarly, what all material is required to be recovered from the applicant is to be gone into by the IO and it is not for the court to get into any such aspect more-so, at this stage.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no substance in the application and the same is rejected.

**A. K. CHAWLA, J**

**JULY 28, 2020**

acm