

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

107

**CRM-M-44964-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.10.2021**

Anil Kumar Yadav

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Sephia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Chaudhary, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL , J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.156 dated 05.10.2021 registered under Sections 406 and 420 IPC and Section 10 of the Immigration Act, 1983, at Police Station Jagadhari Sadar, District Yamuna Nagar, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was an employee of the Company run by main accused Ranjodh Singh. Said Ranjodh Singh, having obtained the details of the petitioner's salary account, got the amount transferred by the complainants in his account. However, under the instructions of said Ranjodh Singh, the said amount stood transferred in the account of one Momita Adhikari. It is, thus, contended that the petitioner has

nothing to do with the occurrence and it is the main accused Ranjodh Singh, who has committed the crime. It is further submitted that a complaint filed by the petitioner for registration of an FIR against the said Ranjodh Singh, is pending before the Court at Dera Bassi.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Ashok Singh Chaudhary, Addl. A. G. Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and submits that the petitioner being one of the key conspirators is required for his custodial interrogation so as to unearth the racket run by the accused for duping the people on the pretext of sending them abroad. He further states that the facts and circumstances on record would clearly depict the active connivance of the petitioner in the crime in question, and, therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties

Indisputably, various amounts were transferred by the complainants in the account of the petitioner. The said fact clearly shows that the petitioner had the prior knowledge of the transactions and he being the employee of accused Ranjodh Singh, had played active role in committing the crime in question. The petitioner cannot wriggle out of his role on the ground that he had acted under the instructions of said Ranjodh Singh, merely being his employee. Even it is the version of the petitioner himself that Ranjodh is absconding and his whereabouts are not known. Thus, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

No case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

28.10.2021

Riya

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No
Whether reportable? Yes/No