

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

**CRM-M-1500-2022 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 07.03.2022**

Ankit Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

**CRM-6799-2022**

Application is allowed as prayed for. Annexure A-1 is taken on record.

**Main case:**

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.168 dated 22.07.2021, registered at Police Station Sushant Lok, Gurugram, under Sections 408, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC.

Status report by way of affidavit dated 10.02.2022 of the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Traffic Hq. Gurugram, already filed in the Registry, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegation against the petitioner is that he was an employee of the company and along

with other co-accused had embezzled Rs. 50 to 70 lakh in cash, fully knowing the fact that the company never deals in cash. He further submits that as a matter of fact, the petitioner had deposited the entire amount received from the customers in the account of the company, but the company is not returning the amount to the customers, who have not been allotted the plots. Moreover, co-accused Rajeev Arora, has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail, by this Court vide order dated 02.03.2022. The petitioner has been in custody since 02.09.2021.

Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail submits that the petitioner had actively participated in the crime and as per the aforesaid status report, an amount of Rs. 1,73,904/- deposited by Suresh Kumar, was credited in the account of Anu Vaid, wife of the petitioner. However, he does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner.

At this, learned counsel for the petitioner though denies the allegations contained in the FIR, yet he submits that the petitioner, in order to show his *bona fide*, is ready to deposit Rs. 1,00,000/- with the trial Court, by way of a Demand Draft.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 02.09.2021. The conclusion of the trial would take a long time. Besides co-accused Rajeev Arora, stands already enlarged on bail. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the

merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate and further subject to the deposit of Rs.1,00,000/-, by way of a demand draft with the trial Court.

It is made clear that on receiving the demand draft, the same would be deposited in a fixed deposit with some nationalized bank, fetching the maximum rate of interest.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)  
JUDGE

07.03.2022  
Mangal Singh

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