

214

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14231-2021

Date of Decision: 06.04.2021

Mohit

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, D.A.G., Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

This petition is filed seeking regular bail in FIR No. 521, dated 05.10.2020, under Sections 489-A, 489-B and 489-C of IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

A secret information was received that Manoj Kumar, resident of Kaithal now residing in Delhi in a rental room was indulging in preparation and supply of counterfeit currency of denomination of Rs. 100 and Rs.500. As per information, Manoj Kumar was coming on 05.10.2020 from Delhi with fake currency and would come to Parakit Pipli. On checking fifty fake currency notes of hundred denomination were recovered from him. During investigation, it surfaced that Manoj Kumar along with Mohit (petitioner) were printing the counterfeit currency. The petitioner was already in custody in case FIR No. 163, dated 22.07.2020. He was arrested in the present case on 13.10.2020. On 14.10.2020 as per the disclosure, fifty sheets of un-cut printed counterfeit currency of denomination of Rs.100, total amounting to Rs. 10,000/- and a original note of Rs.100 being used for preparing counterfeit currency were recovered.

Mr. Sandeep Saini, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not named in the FIR. He is in custody since 13.10.2020. The petitioner was granted bail on 05.02.2021 in FIR No. 163, dated 22.07.2020 and no recovery is to be made.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, on instructions from ASI Dinesh Kumar, submits that petitioner is a habitual offender. He is involved in four other cases and three of these are of similar nature. It is further contended that in another FIR, two printers of EPSON L-405 and L-3116 make, one paper cutter and huge quantity of fake currency were recovered .

The petitioner was actively involved in preparing counterfeit currency, semi finished notes were recovered at his instance. *Albeit*, petitioner was granted bail in all other FIRs, his involvement in other cases, is itself an indicator about the antecedents of the petitioner.

There are no similarities in FIR No. 163 and the present FIR. The case putforth in that case while arguing the bail was that petitioner was trying to use counterfeit currency of Rs.2,000/- at liquor vend and there is recovery of four such currency notes. Whereas, in the present case there is atleast *prima facie* material that the petitioner was not merely possessing counterfeit notes but was actively involved in the preparing fake currency. The mere fact that he was not named in the FIR and his name surfaced in the investigation itself would not be enough for grant of bail.

The petition is dismissed.

However, it is clarified that nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

6th April, 2021

pankaj barweja

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes