

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

**CRM-M-18654 of 2022 (O&M)  
DECIDED ON:27<sup>th</sup> October, 2022**

**Sunil Kumar**

**.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**State of Haryana**

**.....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.**

Present: Mr. D.S. Gandhi, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG Haryana.

\*\*\*

**AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)**

Petitioner is seeking regular bail in case of FIR No. 820, dated 16.12.2019, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and later on added Sections 119, 193, 195, 199, 201, 205, 406, 196, 182 IPC, 1860 and Sections 7 and 13 of P.C. Act, registered at Police Station Hansi City District Hisar. The FIR was registered on the basis of complaint received in S.P. Office Hansi. The complaint was given by Apollo Munich Health Insurance Company Limited alleging that fraud being committed by claiming the insurance claim of terminally ill people by showing their death as a result of road accident. During investigation, number of persons were nominated. Name of the petitioner surfaced in a disclosure statement of Saleem.

The petitioner was a practising lawyer at Hansi and as per the allegations he connived with other co-assued on asking of Kulwant Singh @ Sonu.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case of false implication. No specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. No money was transferred in the account of the petitioner. Petitioner is in custody since 26.11.2021. Investigation is complete. No recovery was made from petitioner, connecting him with the allegations made against him. He relies upon the fact

that co-accused were released on bail and were granted anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail and relies upon the pleading of the reply dated 15.7.2022. She submits that the petitioner was in active connivance with the co-accused. She further submits that the petitioner is involved in seven more cases of similar nature.

The observations made hereinafter are only for the purpose of deciding bail petition and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Name of the petitioner surfaced in disclosure statement. In the reply, there is no specific role attributed to the petitioner. No recovery is to be made, though investigation is complete conclusion of trial is likely to take time. Involvement of petitioner in other FIRs having similar allegations itself would not be a ground to deprive his personal liberty. Considering that co-accused were granted bail, the petitioner is granted bail on furnishing surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition is allowed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending application, if any is rendered infructuous.

**27<sup>th</sup> October, 2022**

*reema*

**(AVNEESH JHINGAN)  
JUDGE**

|                                  |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>No</i>  |