



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

CRM-M-27681-2024

Date of Decision: May 31, 2024

Iqbal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: Mr. S.S. Rangi, Advocate for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(Oral)

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioner prays for grant of pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.42 dated 01.05.2024, under Sections 420, 406, 408, 465, 467 and 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Haryana, District Hoshiarpur.

2. FIR has been lodged on the complaint made by members and officer bearers of village Gobindpur Khun Khun Hoshiarpur Co-operative Agriculture Seva Sabha Society, in which petitioner – Iqbal Singh has been working as Secretary for the last 20-25 years. Said petitioner has been dealing with the records, carrying various cash transactions and making payments of purchase etc. It is alleged that said petitioner has caused wrongful loss to the tune of ₹35-36 lacs to the complainant-society by not showing the receipts. The amount of the Sabha is shown to have been paid without even making any entries in the day book and cash book.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated; that FIR has been lodged due to the political rivalry on the asking of Rachpal Singh, the Vice Chairman of

the society; that case is based upon documentary evidence; and that he is ready to join the investigation.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Mr. Piyush Khanna, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant has placed on record the copy of the details of the amount, so as to contend that total amount of ₹36,53,034/- has been transferred in the account of the petitioner or the co-accused, who had authorized the petitioner to deal with her account.

7. Faced with the aforesaid situation, learned counsel for the petitioner offered to deposit an amount of ₹11 lacs in the account of the complaint-society, provided a reasonable time is granted to him.

8. After hearing learned counsel for both the parties, this Court is not inclined to grant the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, having regard to the nature of the allegations against him and direct attribution to the petitioner in the crime.

Dismissed.

May 31, 2024

sarita

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No