

CRM-M-44952-2022

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

CRM-M-44952-2022

Date of decision: 28.09.2022

Gulab Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Amit Chaudhary, Advocate and
Mr. Japneet Singh Wadhwa, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.197 dated 16.09.2022, registered at Police Station Bhattu Kalan, District Fatehabad, under Sections 419, 420, 409 and 120-B IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner is the Incharge of P.E.G. (Private Entrepreneurs Guarantee) Vinayak Group Godown, hired by HAFED on guarantee basis, and that in addition to it, the petitioner is also taking care of seven other godowns in Fatehabad District. He further contends that allegations of bringing 484 bags of low quality rice from outside and mixing the same into good quality of government rice, are totally false. Rather, the petitioner and other staff members were segregating/cleaning the stocks in view of the duties assigned to them; that

CRM-M-44952-2022

the petitioner has been performing his duties for the last 12 years with due diligence and no complaint whatsoever has ever been made against him. He further contends that the District Manager, who is the main Incharge of the Godown, has not been arraigned as an accused in the present case. He further contends that no quality check was ever carried out by the authorized agency/person.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and gone through the record.

As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner alongwith co-accused had brought 484 bags of low quality rice from outside and mixed the same into good quality of government rice, thereby cheated the department as well as the government. The godown was taken on rent by the HAFED and the rice kept in the godown was meant for distribution to the public at large through public distribution system.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, but without going into minute details of the case, this Court finds that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

28.09.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No