

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

CRM-M-14811-2023

Date of Decision : 23.03.2023

Ranjit

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present : Mr. Parunjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition is for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.40, dated 24.01.2023, registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B, 506, 467, 468, 471 IPC, at Police Station City, Karnal.

On a complaint submitted by one Ashok Kumar, the present FIR was registered. The allegation was that the petitioner and co-accused Amit had promised securing government jobs for him. The complainant allegedly paid a sum of Rs.16,00,000/- for securing government jobs for him. The petitioner and the co-accused are alleged to have given him some fake appointment letter for the post of peon in DAV Senior Secondary School and another appointment letter for some post in the Social Education & Panchayat Department, Panchkula. The complaint was submitted when these letters were found to be fake. Co-accused Amit is stated to have been arrested and is in custody.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He submits that there is a delay in registration of the FIR. It has also been contended that no money was received by the petitioner and even as per the case of the complainant, the money was deposited in the account of co-accused. He submits that the petitioner is the owner of a garments shop and does not even know the complainant. It has been submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be required.

I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner but am unable to agree with the same. The petitioner was specifically named in the FIR alongwith co-accused Amit. Allegations are of promising government jobs and charging exorbitant amounts for the same. Fake appointment letters are also alleged to have been given to the complainant. As to whether the petitioner received some amount or not cannot be determined at this stage. To determine the modus and the nexus, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be imperative.

In view of the above, I do not find any reason to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The present petition is, therefore, dismissed.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

23.03.2023

mamta

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No