

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-21960-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 24.5.2023

Surender ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Goyat, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by SI Bhan Singh.

FIR NO.	DATE	POLICE STATION	OFFENCES
820	16.12.2019	City Hansi, District Hansi	Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, 193, 194, 195, 199, 201, 205 IPC and Sections 7, 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in a case arising out of above mentioned FIR.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Apollo Munich Health Insurance Company Limited wherein it is alleged that some unknown persons had committed a multi-crore fraud with insurance companies in Haryana. The matter was investigated and it was found that the accused used to locate terminally sick persons and convinced the members of families of such sick persons to get them insured against accidental death. The accused by concealing the disease/ailments of such sick persons used to get issued

insurance policies from different insurance companies. It is further the case of prosecution that the accused also used to forge documents like FIRs, post-mortem reports etc. for the purpose of getting insurance claims qua the death of terminally sick persons by showing their deaths to be accidental deaths.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that there is no evidence to connect him with the alleged scam of release of insurance claims on the basis of insurance policies by dubious means and that neither he had signed any document nor he is beneficiary of any such amount.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since the co-accused had suffered disclosure statement nominating the petitioner to be involved in the scam, his complicity is clearly evident. The learned State counsel has informed that the petitioner stands involved in three other similar cases.
5. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. The petitioner is not named in the FIR and came to be nominated on the basis of a disclosure statement made by co-accused Sunil. However, apart from the disclosure statement there is no other evidence to corroborate the said disclosure statement. Neither any amount was found to have been passed on to the petitioner nor any document is shown to be bearing his signatures. Several other co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances including the factum of parity, the petitioner also deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.
7. The petition, as such, is accepted and it is ordered that the petitioner in the event of his arrest shall be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal

bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer.

However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Arresting/Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

24.5.2023
kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No