

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

CRM-M-6206-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.07.2022

Paramjit Singh @ Paramjit Chandila

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG Haryana and
Mr. Ajit Singh, BDPO, Ballabhgarh,
additional charge of Tigaon, District Faridabad.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.270 dated 08.07.2021, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 409, 407 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Sadar Ballabhgarh, District Faridabad, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, who was working as a *Gram Sachiv*, has falsely been involved in the present case,; that the petitioner was having an impeccable service record throughout and that some of the cash memos pertained to the expenditure incurred during the visits of the Ministers, duly mentioned in the Resolutions passed by the Gram Panchayat from time to time; that no amount is to be recovered from the petitioner and that the petitioner did not forge any document.

He further submits that, vide resolution dated 28.12.2020 passed by the Gram Panchayat, an amount of Rs.3,85,000/- was withdrawn by the Sarpanch and thereafter deposited in the accounts of the contractors. No amount was ever transferred in the account of the petitioner for his personal use.

Learned State counsel on instructions from Mr. Ajit Singh, BDPO, who is present in the Court, has drawn the attention of this Court towards the Notification dated 30.12.2020 issued by the Secretary, Rural Development and Panchayat, stipulating therein that no further expenditure be made as the Gram Panchayat Neemka stood merged in Municipal Corporation, Faridabad, w.e.f. 30.12.2021. As per the record brought by Mr. Ajit Singh, BDPO, the entries of the bills have not been made in the cash book, for which the petitioner is responsible being the custodian of the record.

Considering the nature of allegations against the petitioner; and the fact that the issue relates to the public funds, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary. Thus, this Court does not find any ground to grant anticipatory to the petitioner.

In view of the above, the present petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

27.07.2022

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No