

2024:PHHC:069825



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-20248-2024
Date of decision : 17.05.2024

Vikram Ojha Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Vishal Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana.

Proxy Counsel for
Mr. Gautam Kaile, Advocate
for the complainant.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.440 dated 14.09.2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 467, 471 and 120-B of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Narnaud, Hisar.
2. On 10.05.2024, following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at the heart of the dispute is a monetary transaction.

Petitioner is ready to pay an amount of Rs.2.00 lakhs to show his *bona-fide* which should not be taken to be admission on his part. He submits that the release of the such amount should be made subject to the final outcome of the trial.

2024:PHHC:069825



Notice of motion.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-State and seeks time to file reply.

Adjourned to 17.05.2024.

State is directed to ensure the presence of the complainant on the next date.

In the meantime, petitioner is ordered to be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the jail authorities.”

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner is paying the aforesaid amount to show his bonafide and even if the contents of the FIR are taken to be on their face value, whole of the amount travelled to the account of Priyanka Pandey and not the petitioner.
4. Counsel for the complainant as well as State counsel have opposed the bail plea submitting that the fake examination card as well as select list was sent to the victim from the email ID operated from the phone of the petitioner and thus it cannot be said that the petitioner is not involved in the aforesaid racket.
5. Petitioner is behind bars for more than 04 months and 01 day and has no other case pending against him.
6. In view of above, the interim order dated 10.05.2024 passed by this Court is made absolute.
7. Disposed off accordingly.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

17.05.2024
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No