

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

211

CRM-M-27853-2021

Date of Decision: 13.10.2021

ROHIT

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Vikas Lochab, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kirpal Singh Thakur, AAG, Haryana.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J (ORAL)

Case taken up through video conferencing.

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 209 dated 06.05.2021, under Sections 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sonipat Sadar, District Sonipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is alleged that the petitioner had made a WhatsApp group and was informing the vehicle owners about location of the RTA staff conducting checking. He, however, contends that there is no material on record which would connect the petitioner with the alleged commission of offence. The alleged entries in his bank account are *bona fide* business transactions, as the petitioner is a building material supplier and is an income tax payee. He has referred to the copy of the income tax return at Annexure P3. The petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

Learned State counsel contends that although the petitioner has joined the investigation but he is not cooperating. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary as a total amount of Rs.19 lacs was illegally collected by him. He was using 03 mobile phones which were not handed over to the Investigating Officer despite his undertaking to do so. His modus operandi and others involved have to be ascertained.

In view of the serious allegation against the petitioner of illegally collecting money and his not cooperating in the investigation, I do not deem it appropriate to grant him the concession of anticipatory bail. Consequently, the petition is dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

October 13, 2021

anju

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No