

233 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-13686-2022

Date of Decision: 6th April, 2022

Furkan

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Rahul Jaswal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

This petition is filed seeking regular bail in FIR No. 838, dated 26th October, 2021, under Sections 120-B/ 420/ 465/ 467/ 471 of IPC, later on added Sections 419 and 468 of IPC registered at Police Station Quila Panipat, District Panipat.

2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Complainant-Salim. He alleged that he was known of Savvej, Furkhan (petitioner) and he knew Ravinder. The complainant went to the shop of the Ravinder for updating his Aadhaar card where Savvej asked him to give copy of the Aadhaar Card and several blank papers were got signed for opening his bank account. Later the complainant gained knowledge that vehicles were got financed in his name. The role attributed to Ravinder is that from his shop, laptop, printer and Rs.10,000/- were recovered. Petitioner accompanied co-accused Savvej and Janisree along with the complainant and he actively connived with them for managing the scam.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no active role

has been attributed to the petitioner. Petitioner accompanied the co-accused Savvej. He further submits that petitioner is in custody since 28th October, 2021, investigation is complete.

5. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail and submits that two Aadhar cards and rupees three thousand were recovered at the instance of petitioner. She is not in a position to distinguish the parity of the petitioner with co-accused vis-a-vis bail.

6. Considering that petitioner has no criminal antecedents, co-accused was granted bail by this Court and conclusion of the trial is likely to take time, petitioner is granted bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. The petition is allowed.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

6th April, 2022

Parveen Sharma

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