

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

CRM-M-47283-2023
Date of Decision: 02.11.2023

Shyam Lal

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

. . . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Surinder Gaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

By way of this petition filed under Section 438 CrPC, petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.330 dated 29.09.2022 registered at Police Station Julana, District Jind, under section 406/420 IPC.

2. As per prosecution allegations, complaint was made by one Sanjay Kumar, resident of village Julana on 29.09.2022, as per which he and other applicants are residents of Julana and nearby villages. They are laborers and small shopkeepers. Shyam Lal (petitioner) was doing the work of agent in Post Office, who got the RD accounts opened in the name of the complainants. He then took the money from them on interest and used to take monthly installments from them on the pretext of depositing in their RD accounts. He also kept their passbooks with them. After the maturity of the RD account, petitioner used to obtain their signatures on

various forms and then kept the amount by assuring to return the same with interest. However, petitioner did not get the installments deposited in their accounts and kept the same with him. Later on, it was found that petitioner along with his family had escaped after locking his house and without informing anybody.

3. It is contended by Id. counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated; that petitioner never worked as agent of the Post Office; that petitioner is 61 years of old and suffering from various ailments; that he is ready to join the investigation and so, in all these circumstances, he be allowed anticipatory bail.

4. Status report filed by the respondent/State would reveal that numerous people were joined during investigation, who made statements as to how they had been duped in the similar manner by the petitioner. A chart of as many as 18 people has been provided in the police report, who have been duped in by the petitioner to the total amount of ₹1,30,82,000/-. Police report also states that repeated notices under section 41(A) CrPC were served to the petitioner and his co-accused and the same were also sent on the WhatsApp number of his daughter. However, petitioner failed to join the investigation. Petitioner is also involved in two other cases as per the details given in para-No.8 of the status report.

5. Heard.

6. Having regard to the serious nature of allegations against the petitioner and the huge amount, which has been duped from the various people by the petitioner in the same manner, his custodial interrogation will be required, which will be helpful to elicit the entire truth and the

modus operandi and also to recover the amount. This Court does not find the present case to be a fit for grant of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

02.11.2023

Vivek

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

- 1. Whether speaking/reasoned?
- 2. Whether reportable?

Yes
No