



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-30182-2024
Date of Decision: June 19, 2024

Arun TewatiaPetitioner(s)

Vs.

State of HaryanaRespondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. B.R. Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. R. S. Budhwar, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Balwinder Singh, Advocate
for the complainant

SUDEEPTI SHARMA.J. (ORAL)

The present petition is under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 18 dated 12.01.2024, registered under Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, 'IPC') at Police Station Sadar Ballabgarh, District Faridabad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is not the main accused in the offence and he has been falsely implicated in the present case.

3. Learned counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, submits that the petitioner is directly involved in the criminal conspiracy alongwith other accused and cheated the petitioner to the tune of Rs.8,80,000/-. He further submits that this is an admitted fact that there is a bank transaction of Rs.3,30,000/- in



favour of the petitioner, therefore, he is not entitled to grant of concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required since the amount is yet to be recovered from him.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the FIR.

6. A perusal of the FIR shows that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and even the order dated 12.06.2024 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad shows that the petitioner has received an amount to the tune of Rs.3,30,000/- by way of several transactions. Keeping in view his conduct and the allegations levelled against him in the FIR, he does not deserve the concession of grant of anticipatory bail.

7. In view of the above, since the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for the purpose of recovery of amount, therefore, no ground is made out to grant him concession of anticipatory bail and as such the present petition is dismissed.

8. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

June 19, 2024
sonia arora

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