

**205 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-6292-2021
Date of Decision: 3rd December, 2021**

Parveen Bhatnagar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present : Mr. R.K. Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Dimple Jain, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)

1. Due to COVID-19 situation, the Court is convened through video conference.

2. This petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is filed seeking regular bail in FIR No. 595, dated 30th November, 2019, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station HTM, Hisar, District Hisar.

3. As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner was Secretary of Income Tax and Central Government Sect. Society, Hisar. He has duped various people by not repaying the amounts kept in fixed deposits.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case of false implication. The money was deposited in Co-operative Society in which the petitioner was Secretary.

5. Leraned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there is delay of six years in lodging the FIR. The FIR is result as there was some delay in making repayment. The contention is that the petitioner is in custody since 8th February, 2020, investigation is complete. Submission is

in FIR on similar facts this Court has granted bail in other FIRs.

6. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail and relies upon the facts pleaded in the reply. He argues that the petitioner is involved in other FIRs pertaining to the same Co-operative society.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at some length, considering that the investigation is complete, the case is based on documentary evidence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars as conclusion of trial is likely to take time, petitioner is granted bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. The petition is allowed.

9. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

3rd December, 2021

Parveen Sharma

Whether reasoned/speaking
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No