

CRM-M-17809-2019
Date of decision: 14.02.2024

...PETITIONER

V/S

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure is for directing the respondent No.2 and 3 to take action on the complaint dated 17.08.2018 (Annexure P-4).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had received compensation, with regard to the acquisition of land, in his bank account. The private respondents used to help the petitioner to operate his account, as he was the old aged person and respondent No.4 had withdrawn Rs.8,46,433.15/- by way of manipulation through 09 transactions from 28.04.2017 to 11.06.2018. When the petitioner confronted the bank official, the Branch Manager and respondent No.4-Rajesh handed over to him nine policies of PNB Metlife Insurance and informed him that he had purchased these policies 02 years back and on account of purchase, the said amount was withdrawn. The petitioner was not aware of any such purchase nor had he ever signed any document for the purchase of these policies and the Branch Manager and respondent No.4 have withdrawn this amount without his

consent. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner was 77 years of age at that time and it is beyond comprehension, how the insurance policies were made in the name of such an elderly person.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel refers to the reply filed on behalf of respondent No.1-State and submits that during enquiry, it was found that petitioner himself had purchased these policies, after coming to the bank and he himself had appeared for online signatures on the declaration form etc. and the complaint dated 17.08.2018 (Annexure P-4) was enquired into, on the basis of the signatures of the petitioner on vouchers, the amount was transferred from his account for purchase of these policies and further, the allegations contained in the afore-stated complaint were found to be false and police has recommended that no further action is required.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds no ground for issuance of any further directions and the present petition stands dismissed, however, the petitioner would be at liberty to avail alternative remedies, as available to him, in accordance with law.

February 14, 2024

manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |