

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

**CRM-M-45808 of 2021(O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.08.2022**

Harpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

**Present:- Mr. Saurabh Kapoor, Advocate and
 Ms. Ojaswini, Advocate
 For the petitioner.**

Mr. Naveen Sheoran, DAG Haryana.

**Mr. Ashit Malik, Advocate
For the complainant.**

KARAMJIT SINGH, J.

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in case having FIR No. 06 dated 08.01.2021, registered under Sections 408, 420, 467, 468, 471, 180, 201 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Sector-17, HUDA, Jagadhri, District Yamuna Nagar.

The counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case by the complainant. The petitioner has not embezzled any amount belonging to the complainant or his company. The counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner never transferred any such money in the bank account of his wife. The petitioner is having no criminal history. The counsel further submits that the petitioner

is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 01 month and that complainant has already been examined during the trial and as such there is no necessity to keep the petitioner behind the bars.

The present petition is opposed by the State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant, both of whom submit that the petitioner siphoned off huge amount from the accounts of the Company owned by the complainant, where he was employed. However, the custody period of the petitioner and the fact that during trial the complainant has been examined are not refuted by them.

I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

All the offences in the present case are triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class. The petitioner is in custody for the last more than one year and one month and he is having no criminal antecedents. The investigation has been completed and during trial complainant has been examined. The allegations of embezzlement of money are matter of evidence. It will take considerable time for the trial to conclude. As the complainant has been examined, there is no apprehension that if released on bail, the petitioner is going to influence the complainant. In the given circumstances, no useful purpose is going to be served by keeping the petitioner in custody for any longer period.

In view of the above, without commenting on the merits of the case, instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on

regular bail during trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

09.08.2022
Jiten

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No