

210-5 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-30683-2021 (O&M)

Decided on: 10th March, 2022

Dharambir

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. V.P.Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Dimple Jain, AAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. This petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is filed seeking regular bail in FIR No. 0121, dated 3rd June, 2020, under Sections 379, 420, 467, 468, 471 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (later on added Sections 201, 473, 484, 120 B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 7 and 13 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988) registered at Police Station Dadri City, Charkhi Dadri.

2. As per the case set up, acting upon a secret information Parveen was apprehended by the police party on 3rd June, 2020 at Charkhi Dadri from his possession one Scorpio car without proper documents having tampered engine and chassis number was recovered. During interrogation, he disclosed that he had sold eight to ten vehicles and after altering the engine and chassis number in collusion with officials of SDM office got them registered after preparing forged documents. During investigation fourteen vehicles were recovered. The role attributed to the

petitioner is that he purchased one vehicle from co-accused Ramesh and sold it further to Jai Bhagwan. Ramesh got the vehicle registered at RTO, Meham and thereafter, No Objection Certificate was issued in favour of Dharambir for registering the vehicle at Charkhi Dadri.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 8th August, 2020 and he was a bonafide purchaser, he had purchased the vehicle and sold to further. He relies upon the fact that co-accused Ramesh was granted bail by the Sessions Court.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions submits that petitioner is involved in two more cases. She fairly submits that challan stands presented.

5. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, considering the role attributed to the petitioner, no recovery was made from him, investigation is complete and conclusion of the trial is likely to take time and co-accused was granted bail, petitioner is granted bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

6. The petition is allowed.

7. 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

10th March, 2022
Parveen Sharma

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