

223

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

CRM-M-8388-2022

Date of Decision: 03.03.2022

Randeep Singh and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Rajat Mor, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Tejpal Dhull, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.54 dated 04.02.2022, under Sections 405, 420, 506 & 120-B of the IPC, Sections 3, 4, & 5 of the Prize Chits and Money Circulation Scheme (Banning) Act, 1978, Sections 3(d), 3(f), 3(i) & 10 of the Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution Notification Act, 28 December, 2021, registered at Police Station Sector-17 HUDA, Jagadhri, District Yamuna Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are in custody, since 05.02.2022. He submitted that although the period of custody is very short but in the present case the petitioners have been falsely implicated because of some misunderstanding. He further submitted

that in the present case the allegations against the main accused, namely, Mohit are that the company was taking money from various people for getting them jobs and thereafter, money was embezzled, but so far as the present petitioners are concerned, they are neither the partners of the company nor the employees of the company but since the company is engaged in the business of selling clothes etc., they are only the distributors of the company and it appears that due to some misunderstanding the present petitioners have been roped in the present FIR. He further submitted that both the petitioners have clean antecedents and they are not involved in any other case.

On the other hand, Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana has stated that it is correct that both the petitioners are not involved in any other case and that the allegations are against the main accused, namely, Mohit.

At this stage, Mr. Tejpal Dhull, Advocate has caused appearance on behalf of the complainant and has submitted that it is correct that it was due to some misunderstanding that the names of the petitioners have been included in the FIR and they are only distributors of the Company and they were not involved in taking money from the complainant.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

In view of the aforesaid position that the petitioners are having clean antecedents and are not involved in any other case and as per the FIR, the role assigned was only against the main accused, namely, Mohit and also trial of the case would take a long time, therefore, considering the totality of the circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit and proper to grant bail to the petitioners. Consequently, the present petition is allowed and

the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is only meant for the purpose of decision of present petition.

03.03.2022

Bhumika

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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