

241

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

\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M-55679-2022  
Date of Decision: 06.12.2022**

Gulshan Anand

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present: Mr. P.K. Chugh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen S. Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)**

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.608 dated 17.06.2022, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sahabad, District Kurukshetra.

It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that it is a case where the petitioner has been falsely implicated on the face of it and he is in custody since 28.06.2022, which is more than 5 months. He further submitted that as per the allegations in the complaint on the basis of which the FIR was lodged, the complainant has alleged that he received a telephonic call from somebody who himself purported to be an officer of Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India (IRDAI) and he

told him that since the LIC policy of his sister has matured which is of the amount of Rs.80,00,000/- and in case he gives the requisite fees etc. then the same can be taken by him on maturity. According to the FIR, the complainant acting upon the telephone call, gave Rs.16,00,000/- on different occasions which were transferred in different bank accounts, so that the maturity amount can be released. He also submitted that no amount was transferred in the name of the petitioner but as per the allegations some amount was thereafter transferred in his name.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the FIR on the face of it seems to be false and frivolous and rather improbable and unnatural because the allegations were that for the purpose of getting the maturity amount of Rs.80,00,000/- of LIC policy the complainant has paid Rs.16,00,000/- to an unknown caller whereas the LIC offices are situated at every small place in the country and anybody who wants the redemption of the LIC amount on maturity when the amount to be redeemed is legal amount then he can always approach the concerned LIC Officer but would never given a huge amount of Rs.16,00,000/- for the purpose of taking the maturity of the amount which he is otherwise legally entitled, and therefore, it is a case where the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He also submitted that now the investigation has already been completed and it is a case which is triable by the Magistrate and the trial of the case may take long time. He further submitted that the other co-accused, namely, Chandrakant Rana has already been extended the benefit of regular bail by this Court in CRM-M-54711-2022 on 01.12.2022 and the present petitioner is at parity with the aforesaid co-accused, and therefore, has prayed that the

petitioner may also be considered for the grant of regular bail.

On the other hand, Mr. Naveen S. Panwar, learned DAG, Haryana has stated that it is correct that the petitioner is in custody since 28.06.2022 and the present case is triable by the Magistrate. He further submitted that it is also correct that the other co-accused, namely, Chandrakant Rana, has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 01.12.2022 in CRM-M-54711-2022.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The other accused, namely, Chandrakant Rana, who has been granted regular bail by this Court is at parity with the present petitioner. The investigation of the case is completed and the present case is triable by the Magistrate. Therefore, this Court without expressing anything on the merits of the case, deems it fit and proper to grant bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is only meant for the purpose of decision of present petition.

**06.12.2022***Bhumika***(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)  
JUDGE**

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