

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

CRM-M-61126-2022
Decided on: 28.12.2022

Anil Kumar

.... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

This is the petition under Section 438 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.36 dated 07.02.2022 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC registered at Police Station City Safidon District Jind.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the false implication of the petitioner in the FIR in question is evident from the fact that neither was he named in the FIR in question nor any role attributed to him. Learned counsel submits that it was only on the basis of a disclosure statement, the petitioner was nominated as an accused. Learned counsel further submits that no doubt the petitioner was the manager of the bank from where the co-accused had taken a loan on the basis of some forged documents, however, he was not even a beneficiary of the alleged transaction.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the FIR in question.

No doubt, the petitioner has not been named in the FIR in question, however, as per the disclosure statement of co-accused Chander Shekhar, the petitioner being the manager of the bank was approached by the accused for the

purpose of obtaining a loan and it was he, who had then put them through to another person namely Hakikat, to suggest a way out in obtaining a loan from the bank. Thereafter, said Hakikat, in collusion with the petitioner himself, got the loan sanctioned on the basis of forged documents (jamabandi). Allegedly, the petitioner along with Hakikat also demanded 30% of the sanctioned loan amount.

Learned State counsel has, on instructions, also apprised the Court that the petitioner is involved in some other cases of forgery.

Prima facie there are serious allegations against the petitioner of colluding with co-accused Hakikat and, on the basis of forged and fabricated documents, arranging bank loan, running into lakhs of rupees, for the co-accused.

In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the concession of extra-ordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

28.12.2022
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether reportable?:	Yes/No
Whether speaking/non-speaking?:	Yes/No