

218

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

**CRM-M-31347-2021
Date of decision 27.10.2021**

Chand @ Chandi Ram

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

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

Ms. Geeta Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

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 F.I.R. No. 76, dated 3rd March, 2020, under Sections 420, 468, 471, 464, 465, 193 and 120-B IPC and Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Rai, District Sonapat.

[3] The F.I.R. was registered on the basis of complaint received from Investigator of insurance company that fake insurance claims

were being applied by some persons by purporting the cause of death of their relatives as road accident whereas the deceased were cancer patients. The allegation against the petitioner is that he claimed the compensation of death of his father under Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 [hereinafter referred to as 'Act'] whereas cause of death was cancer.

[4] Mr. Parminder Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has not received any compensation till date. He further submits that as per case set up, the king pin was Pawan Bhoria, he relies upon the fact that Pawan Bhoria was granted bail by the High Court. It is contended that investigation is complete and challan stands presented.

[5] Ms. Geeta Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail and submits that it is a big scam. The petitioner had submitted a claim for compensation under the Act whereas cause of death of the deceased was cancer.

[6] The issue regarding cause of death of father of the petitioner is debatable issue. No recovery is to be made. Co-accused Pawan Bhoria has already been granted bail by this Court. Investigation is complete, conclusion of trial is likely to take time.

[7] Considering the facts and circumstances of the case in totality, the 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

27th October, 2021
pankaj baweja

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes /No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes /No |