

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2021 Aug 13 19:47
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM-M-12029-2021 (O/M)
Date of decision : 12.8.2021

Samandar

..... Petitioner (s)

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

Present: Mr. P.C. Sen, Advocate
for petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Malik, DAG Haryana.

(Through Video Conferencing)

:-

:-

HARINDER SINGH SIDHU, J.

This is a petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 162, dated 28.5.2019 registered under Sections 406, 420 IPC at Police Station Khol, District Rewari.

The allegations against petitioner are that he was working as Relationship Manager with Fusion Micro Finance Company. As a part of his job, he had to collect installments from persons who have availed loan from the company. It is alleged that on 15.5.2019, petitioner visited village Bhoka Khol where he went to 10 ladies who were part of group and told them that if they deposit the outstanding installments of loan plus Rs. 11300/- by way of insurance within 8 days, each member would be given a loan of Rs. 190000/-.

It has come out during investigation that outstanding loan and insurance amount collected by petitioner from 34 ladies of said village was amounting to Rs. 1056000/-. However, it is alleged that petitioner did not deposit said amount with company and the loan as promised by him was not sanctioned.

Learned counsel for petitioner has argued that allegations against petitioner are totally false. He states that infact petitioner's brother visited village Bhoka Khol on 15.5.2019. He states that this fact can be verified from movement register maintained by company. He further states that the fact petitioner is being

CRM-M-12029-2021 (O/M)

-2-

implicated because the Managers of company had threatened to teach him a lesson for availing leaves for two marriage in the month of May, 2019.

It is not possible to accept the contention of learned counsel for petitioner. The allegations against petitioner are specific. The ladies have identified the petitioner as the same person who had collected installments of loan and insurance amount from them.

In view thereof, no ground is made for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner.

Dismissed.

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE

12.8.2021
sjks

Whether reasoned order : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No