

**CRM-M-10601-2021 and
CRM-M-9378-2022**

-1-

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

Decided on: 16th March, 2022

1. CRM-M-10601-2021

Sanjiv @ Banti

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

2. CRM-M-9378-2022

Surender

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Balkar Singh, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-10601-2021.

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate and
Mr. Ashwani Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-9378-2022.

Ms. Dimple Jain, AAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. Petitioners are before this Court seeking regular bail in FIR No. 265, dated 27th August, 2020, under Sections 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 7 and 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Murthal, District Sonapat.

2. As per the allegations, the Sarpanch and the Secretary, Gram Panchayat in connivance with the private persons cause financial loss to the Gram Panchayat, Malikpur. The loss was assessed of Rs.95,41,710/-. The petitioners are the owners of the concerns who allegedly carried out the development work which was not done.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the main accused-Sarpanch was granted anticipatory bail by this Court. It is contended that the loss amount was deposited by the Sarpanch. Petitioners are in custody since 15th October, 2020 and no further recovery is to be made from them.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail but she is not in a position to dispute the fact that Sarpanch was granted anticipatory bail by this Court and the amount of assessed loss was deposited by Sarpanch. She submits that petitioners are involved in four more cases.

5. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, considering that co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by this Court, investigation is complete, no further recovery is to be made from the petitioners and conclusion of the trial is likely to take time, petitioner is granted bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

6. The petitions are allowed.

7. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
8. Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

16th March, 2022
Parveen Sharma

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