

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

205

CRM-M-13223-2021

Date of Decision: 20.05.2021

Daljit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Sheoran, DAG, Haryana
assisted by SSP Vivek Kundu.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.467 dated 25.09.2018 registered at Police Station, Sector-5, Panchkula under Sections 409/420/467/468/471/120-B IPC.
2. The allegations in nutshell, as per the FIR, are to the effect that the Directorate of Agriculture had floated a scheme for giving subsidy to the farmers, who opted for 'Drip Irrigation System' so as to encourage drip irrigation for the purpose of conserving water. It is alleged that several officials of the Department of Agriculture, Haryana connived and had got released subsidy on the basis of forged documents and forged thumb impressions of farmers and

which has been got credited into the account of the supplier (Supplier of Drip Irrigation System) instead of crediting the same in the accounts of the farmers. It is further the case of the prosecution that when such farmers were contacted, they disclosed that they had never ever applied for such subsidy and never had such Drip Irrigation System installed. The said subsidies are stated to have been released during the years 2011-12 to 2015-16.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he had remained posted as Agriculture Development Officer for a period of about 3 months i.e. from October, 2012 to January, 2013 and that he cannot be attributed the alleged embezzlement of the amount in question. It has further been submitted that the petitioner in any case has been behind bars since the last more than 3 months and that since challan stands presented, he deserves to be released on bail.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since it is a scam involving embezzlement of an amount to the tune of about Rs.17 crores, no case for grant of bail is made out. Learned State counsel has, however, not disputed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 3 months and that challan already stands presented and also that some other co-accused have already been granted bail including anticipatory bail. Learned State counsel has further informed that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the aforestated factual position, wherein investigation already stands concluded and challan stands presented, no useful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner, who has already been behind bars since the last about 3 months. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

20.05.2021
VY/Vimal

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**
Whether reportable: **Yes/No**