

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

CRM-M-29262-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.04.2022

Satish Chand

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Narinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Deepinder Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 0369 dated 14.06.2019, registered under Sections 408 and 420 of the IPC at Police Station Camp Palwal, District Palwal.

The operative part of the order dated 26.09.2019, vide which the petitioner has been granted interim bail, is reproduced below:

“Learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner contends that the allegations in the FIR against the petitioner are that when he was working as a General Manager in the Automobile Company, he had embezzled a sum of ₹13,97,000/- by not depositing the money received by him from the customers for the sale of vehicles. He also contends that the petitioner was the General Manager and he was to look after two agencies and there were several officials whose responsibility was to collect the cash, issue receipt and only thereafter allow the vehicle to leave the premises. He further contends that only the petitioner has

been implicated and no other official, who was working in the Company, has been involved in the FIR. It is not possible for the petitioner alone to embezzle the money. He further contends that the FIR is the outcome of a professional rivalry as the petitioner himself was interested in getting a dealership in his name.

Adjourned to 18.11.2019.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, in pursuance to the order dated 26.09.2019, has already appeared before the SHO/Investigating Officer and has joined the investigation.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has not disputed the factual position and submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no more required for any further investigation.

In view of the above and also considering the fact that the petitioner was granted the interim bail on 26.09.2019 and since then, a period of almost two and a half year has lapsed, however, there is no allegation that the petitioner has ever misused the interim bail or has extended any threat to complainant or any other witness, the present petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner, vide order dated 26.09.2019, is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

07.04.2022

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No