

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

BENCH : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Date of Decision: 10th May 2024

CRM-M-36015-2023 and CRM-M-44766-2023

ASHOK KUMAR SAHNI ...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA ...RESPONDENT

SUPRIYA NAKRA ...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA ...RESPONDENT

Legislation and Rules:

Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 120B of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).

Subject: Anticipatory bail applications involving accusations of siphoning funds intended for the purchase of mobile phone accessories, implicating the petitioners in substantial financial misappropriations.

Headnotes:

Criminal Procedure – Anticipatory Bail – Denial of bail due to significant evidence indicating siphoning of funds – Petitioners Ashok Kumar Sahni and Supriya Nakra accused of redirecting Rs.2.02 crores meant for purchasing mobile phone accessories into accounts controlled by themselves and associates – Detailed investigation reveals large scale financial misappropriations across several related accounts – Both petitioners have previous criminal records with similar charges – Applications for anticipatory bail dismissed based on prima facie establishment of offenses and potential influence on ongoing investigation [Paras 2-15].

Role of Accused and Company Operations – Ashok Kumar Sahni, serving as director, was not actively involved in day-to-day operations but had substantial control and influence over financial transactions – Supriya Nakra, despite not being named initially in the FIR, was found deeply involved as the authorized signatory and administrator of company’s accounts, implicating her in the operational fraud – Detailed transaction records from company accounts indicate deliberate misdirection of funds [Paras 4, 6-9, 13].

Decision – High Court concludes involvement of petitioners in systematic siphoning of funds, fraud, and forgery based on transaction trails and their roles within the company – Previous grants of bail to co-accused based on insufficient evidence at the time, now overturned due to emerging details from the ongoing investigation – Anticipatory bail denied, underscoring the severity of allegations and ongoing criminal behavior [Para 14].

Referred Cases:

- Sumitha Pradeep Vs. Arun Kumar C.K. & Anr., 2022 Live Law (SC) 870

Representing Advocates:

Mr. Keshavam Chaudhari, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Gurmandeep Singh Sullar, Advocate with Ms. Devaki Anand Sullar, Advocate for respondent No.2-complainant.

.....
JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

This order shall dispose of two petitions bearing No.CRMM-36015-2023 titled as Ashok Kumar Sahni Versus State of Haryana and CRM-M-44766-2023 titled as Supriya Nakra Versus State of Haryana as the same are arising out of the same FIR. However, for the sake of convenience the facts have been taken from CRM-M-237362023.

2. The prayer in the present petitions under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. is for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.49 dated 01.03.2023 registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 120B IPC at Police Station Industrial Area, Bhiwani.

3. The present FIR came to be registered on the complaint of Naresh Kumar Ahuja son of Pannu Ram Ahuja with the allegations that entities controlled by him and his wife had paid a sum of Rs.2.02 crores to M/s MDM Televentures Pvt. Ltd. Gurugram for supply of mobile phone accessories but the same had not been supplied thereby committing the offences in question. The copy of the complaint leading to the registration of the FIR is as under:-

“To

The Superintendent of Police, Bhiwani.

Subject : Complaint seeking registration of case F.I.R. and legal action against

1. Pardepto Gaungly 9830954544, 8766228966, 9315133916,

9831034344 2. Monish Mittal Mob. 8278857314 3. Deepak Nakra Mob.

8800008088 4. Silka Saloni Biswal 9903090102 5. Ashok Kumar Sahni C/o

M.D.M. Televentures Pvt. Ltd (CIN-U 51909HR 2019PTC079047), 416, 4 F,

Fourth Floor, ILD Trade Centre, Sector 47, Guguram, Haryana 122018.

Sir,

It is submitted that I, Naresh Kumar S/o Sh. Punnu Ram Ahuja am resident of Bajrang Bali Colony, Rohtak Gate, Bhiwani. I have been running whole sale trading business in the name and style 'Ahuja Enterprises' at Bajrang Bali Colony, Rohtak Gate, Bhiwani and am Proprietor of Ahuja Enterprises. Apart from this, I run whole sale trading and Distribution business in the name of another firm at Shop No. 2 Bajrang Bali Colony, Rohtak Gate, Bhiwani, in the name of Vaishno Distributions and the Proprietor of our Firm Vaishno Distributions, is none other than my wife Smt. Neelam Rani. The business of our both the Firms is run under the supervision and management of mine and my son Tanuj Ahuja. M.D.M. Televentures Pvt. Ltd. Guguram, Haryana 122018 run whole sale business of REALME MOBILE PHONES ACCESSORIES and the aforesaid accused persons of M.D.M. Televentures Pvt. Ltd, Guguram, were the authorized Distributors/sales agent of entire Haryana State of REALME MOBILE PHONES ACCESSORIES. For about last two years, for the business of my aforesaid both the Firms, I had been purchasing REALME MOBILE PHONES ACCESSORIES on wholesale basis against the advance payment from the above said accused persons, I for purchasing REALME MOBILE PHONES ACCESSORIES on whole sale; at

the instance of the accused persons, time to time, by way of RTGS on various dates till 24.11.2022 had been depositing money in the account of M.D.M. Televentures Pvt. Ltd. maintained with State Bank of India, Gurugram, Standard Chartered Bank, Gurugram and at last on 24.11.2022, I at the instance of the accused; for purchase of the goods, by way of RTGS had transferred/deposited Rs. 77,00,000/- from our Firms Vaishno Distributions' Axis Bank Account in M.D.M. Televentures Pvt. Ltd's Standard Chartered Bank, Gurugram Account. Apart from this, at the instance of the accused persons, for purchase of the goods, on 24.11.2022 from our other Firm Ahuja Enterprises' Axis Bank Account had deposited Rs. 17-17 lacs i.e. total Rs. 34,00,000/- in M.D.M. Televentures Pvt. Ltd's Standard Chartered Bank, Gurugram Account. On 24.11.2022, after depositing the above said amount, the accused persons, despite my repeated requests, e-mails, telephonic requests and visiting them time and again personally and making my repeated requests; the stock of REALME MOBILE PHONES was not supplied to us; whereupon I settled the accounts on 7.1.2023 of the advance amount deposited with the accused persons and found that our firm Vaishno Distributors' Rs. 1,62,64,586.10 and of our firm Ahuja Enterprises Rs.39,71,296.75 i.e. total Rs.2,02,35,882.67 are deposited with the accused persons as advance money. In that regard, copy of email statement dated 7.1.2023 is enclosed herewith. I have made requests time and again personally, by making phone calls and by way of e-mails to the accused persons that either the accused as per our demand should supply the REALME MOBILE PHONES accessories to us or should return our Rs. 2,02,35,882.67 to us but the accused earlier had been making excuses on one pretext or the other and the accused out of our advance money deposited; in lieu of some money, had given us Maruti Eco Commercial loading car Registration no. HR 55AJ 7609 with value of Rs. 2,00,000/- to me and the accused had assured to get this car transferred in our name at the earliest but the accused persons have not get transferred the said car in our name till date; and not the accused have flatly refused to supply us the goods and to return our aforesaid amount; rather extended threat that if we talk about the money even then me and my son Tarun Ahuja would have to face dire consequences and would get me eliminated. It is pertinent to mention here that the accused persons with their bad intention not to return our aforesaid amount and with an intention to avoid their liability of State Bank of India, Gurugram; they got registered fake and false report within their Company Account no. 40469785077 of State Bank of India, Gurugram to the

effect that the amount of Rs. 36,00,000/- are due to them from our Vaishno Distributors; whereupon the State Bank of India, Gurugram having sent us a notice/letter dated 20.1.2023 had directed that as to what amount of accused persons and their company is due from us; we should deposit the above said amount in the aforesaid account of the above company of the accused notwithstanding that even a single penny is due from us to the accused/their company/Firm from our Firm rather our aforesaid amount is due to us from the accused persons and their Firm and we are in possession of confession mail thereof. As such, the accused persons aforesaid having connived amongst themselves and hatching a conspiracy; having committed cheating, forgery and breach of trust have usurped our Rs. 2,02,35,882.67 and the accused having refused to return our said money have committed cheating. I have come to know that the accused persons; likewise me; have usurped the money of other traders also; due to which, I and my family have to face mental and economic harassments. It is therefore, prayed to your good-self that after registering case F.I.R. against the accused immediately; the accused may kindly be arrested at the earliest because the accused at any time to avoid payment of my amount and that of other traders; by closing their office may fled abroad. The accused may kindly be get awarded deterrent punishment and our amount of Rs. 2,02,35,882.67 may be got recovered from the accused to us and we may be imparted justice and oblige.

Thanking you,

Sd/- Naresh Kumar S/o Punnu Ram Ahuja, Dated:3.2.23 R/o Bajrang Bali Colony, Rohtak Gate,

Bhiwani. Mob. No. 9992092500” 4.

Pursuant to the registration of the FIR, the complainant was joined in investigation and the records and accounts statements pertaining to Ahuja Enterprises and Vaishno Distribution firms were obtained. The records and accounts statements of 7 accounts of M/s MDM Televentures Pvt. Ltd. were obtained and taken into possession. From the scrutiny of those documents it was found that the co-accused Silka Saloni Biswal, Supriya Nakra (petitioner in CRM-M-44766-2023), Monish Mittal and Ashok Kumar (petitioner in CRM-M-36015-2023) were the authorized signatories of the company's bank accounts. Tanuj Ahuja, the son of the complainant produced the master data of the accused company M/s MDM Televentures Pvt. Ltd., the list of debtors and creditors, the list of directors of the company and four cheques. From the scrutiny of these documents it was found that petitioner-Ashok Kumar Sahni was a Director of the Company whereas he along with petitioner-Supriya

Nakra and others were also authorized signatories in the company's bank accounts. During the course of investigation, Monish Mittal was arrested and recoveries were effected from him. He disclosed that he had forged the signatures of Silka Saloni Biswal on two cheques in favour of the complainant firms for an amount of Rs.39,41,672/- and Rs.1,60,31,369/-. Accordingly, Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC were added in the case.

5. The co-accused Pardipto Ganguly and the present petitioners filed petitions for the grant of anticipatory bail. During the pendency of the petitions, the investigation was going on and it was found that Pardipto Ganguly was a Director of M/s MDM Televentures Pvt. Ltd. between 01.02.2020 and 12.02.2020. Thereafter, he joined as a Director on 02.04.2022 and continued as such. Pardipto Ganguly was found to be the person behind all operations. Silka Saloni Biswal was his daughter and the authorized signatory in the bank accounts of M/s MDM Televentures Pvt. Ltd. She was also a whole time Director. Ashok Kumar Sahani was the Director of M/s MDM Televentures Pvt. Ltd. from 30.11.2021 till date. He is the father of Supriya Nakra who's husband Deepak Nakra was an employee of the REAL ME Mobile Telecommunication Company Cyber City, Gurugram. Supriya Nakra was the authorized signatory of the accounts of M/s MDM Televentures Pvt. Ltd., the OTP approver of the main accounts of the Company and also the administrative head. Co-accused Monish Mittal was first a Director of M/s MDM Televentures Pvt. Ltd. after which he was appointed as Chief Financial Officer and an authorized signatory in the bank accounts. He was arrested and has been granted the concession of regular bail.

6. The State filed affidavits showing the details of the bank accounts to which money was transferred from the bank accounts of the accused Company M/s MDM Televentures Pvt. Ltd. A perusal of the chart produced would show that a huge amount of money in crores has been transferred from the bank accounts of the Company into the accounts of Pardipto Ganguly, his family members, other accused and companies/entities controlled by the other accused including the petitioners. It has been stated in the reply that as there are a large number of transactions, the investigation regarding the same was on going.
7. The learned counsel for the petitioner while referring to the case of Ashok Kumar Sahni contends that he is of the age of 71 years and is ailing. Though, he was a Director, he was not involved in the day- to-day workings of the Company. He himself had made complaints against Pardipto Ganguly,

Monish Mittal and others to the Commissioner of Police, Gurugram for siphoning off Rs.30 crores. FIR No.395 dated 15.06.2023, U/s 408 and 420 IPC, P.S. Gurgaon Sadar stood registered against Pardipto Ganguly and others at the instance of the petitioner. The investigation conducted so far would show that no money had been transferred from the accounts of the accused company into the personal accounts of the petitioner. Monish Mittal was arrested and had been granted the concession of regular bail. As the case was based on documentary evidence and he was ready and willing to join investigation, he was entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

8. With respect to petitioner-Supriya Nakra, the learned counsel for the petitioner contends that she was not named in the FIR. She was a lady and an employee only on paper. As the case was primarily of a civil nature and based on documentary evidence, she too was entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail moreso when in the case of Monish Mittal this Court had observed that it would be a moot point during the course of the Trial as to whether the allegations would constitute a civil dispute or if a criminal offence was made out.

9. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that petitioner-Ashok Kumar Sahni was a Director of the Company. He had levelled allegations against his co-accused Pardipto Ganguly to avoid his own liability. Though at this stage, the investigation did not reveal that any money had come into the personal bank accounts of the petitioner, the investigation did show that various amounts of money had gone into bank accounts of entities controlled by relatives of the petitioner. Therefore, as the offence was *prima facie* established, he was not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail moreso when he was a habitual offender with 03 other cases bearing FIR No.60 dated 23.02.2023, U/s 406, 420, P.S. Rajpur Dehradun, FIR No.252 dated 01.05.2023, U/s 406, 420, 506, P.S. Ambala Cantt. and FIR No.603 dated 26.07.2023, U/s 406, 420, 506, 120B, P.S. Hisar City registered against him.

As regards petitioner-Supriya Nakra, the learned State counsel contends that the investigation revealed that she was the authorized signatory of the accounts of the accused company, the OTP approver of the main accounts and also administrative head. She was also the daughter of Ashok Kumar Sahni. Her husband Deepak Nakra was an employee of REALME Mobile Telecommunication Company Cyber City, Gurugram and had facilitated the deal with the accused company and M/s Realme. The investigation had

revealed that various amounts from the bank accounts of the accused company were transferred into entities controlled by relatives and associates of the petitioner. As the offence was *prima facie* established and the investigation was to be taken to its logical conclusion, she too was not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail *moreso* when one other case bearing FIR No.60 dated 23.02.2023, U/s 406, 420, P.S. Rajpur Dehradun stood registered against her.

10. The learned counsel for the complainant submits that the investigation conducted so far has clearly established that the payments made by the complainant firms and various other entities to the accused company were siphoned off into bank accounts of the petitioners, other accused and entities controlled by the petitioners and the other accused. The investigation was still ongoing and the extent of the fraud would be revealed only in time. However, petitioner-Ashok Kumar Sahni was admittedly a Director whereas both the petitioners were also authorized signatories in the bank accounts. He, therefore contends that the petitioners were not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail as the allegations could not be said to amount to a civil dispute alone.

11. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

12. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Sumitha Pradeep Vs. Arun Kumar C.K. & Anr.*** 2022 Live Law (SC) 870 held that merely because custodial interrogation was not required by itself could not be a ground to grant anticipatory bail. The first and the foremost thing the Court hearing the anticipatory bail application is to consider is the *prima facie* case against the accused. The relevant extract of the judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“It may be true, as pointed out by learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.1, that charge-sheet has already been filed. It will be unfair to presume on our part that the Investigating Officer does not require Respondent No.1 for custodial interrogation for the purpose of further investigation.

Be that as it may, even assuming it a case where Respondent No.1 is not required for custodial interrogation, we are satisfied that the High Court ought not to have granted discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

We are dealing with a matter wherein the original complainant (appellant herein) has come before this Court praying that the anticipatory bail granted by the High Court to the accused should be cancelled. To put it

in other words, the complainant says that the High Court wrongly exercised its discretion while granting anticipatory bail to the accused in a very serious crime like POCSO and, therefore, the order passed by the High Court granting anticipatory bail to the accused should be quashed and set aside. In many anticipatory bail matters, we have noticed one common argument being canvassed that no custodial interrogation is required and, therefore, anticipatory bail may be granted. There appears to be a serious misconception of law that if no case for custodial interrogation is made out by the prosecution, then that alone would be a good ground to grant anticipatory bail. Custodial interrogation can be one of the relevant aspects to be considered along with other grounds while deciding an application seeking anticipatory bail. There may be many cases in which the custodial interrogation of the accused may not be required, but that does not mean that the prima facie case against the accused should be ignored or overlooked and he should be granted anticipatory bail. The first and foremost thing that the court hearing an anticipatory bail application should consider is the prima facie case put up against the accused. Thereafter, the nature of the offence should be looked into along with the severity of the punishment. Custodial interrogation can be one of the grounds to decline custodial interrogation. However, even if custodial interrogation is not required or necessitated, by itself, cannot be a ground to grant anticipatory bail.

13. A perusal of the record would show that after the complainant entities transferred a sum of Rs.2.02 crores into the bank accounts of the accused company, the said company did not transfer the payment to M/s Realme Mobile Telecommunication India Pvt. Ltd. for supply of mobile phone accessories. On the contrary, the amount received from the complainant as also various other amounts received from other persons/companies have been siphoned off in a systematic manner by the petitioners, their co-accused and the entities controlled by them. Though the investigations are ongoing, the details of some of the transfers are as under:-

Sr. No.	Name of companies	Name of Banks and accounts	Time period of transactions	Amount	Name of beneficiary	Relation of accused

		<i>numbe rs</i>				
1	<i>MD M</i>	<i>Stand ard Charte red Bank Gurug ram A/c No.53 10512 1597 & A/c No.53 10512 2593</i>	<i>03.05. 2019 to 30.11. 2022</i>	<i>97,67 ,414/ Recei ved by the prese nt petiti oner Pardi pto Gang uly from MDM</i>	<i>Pardi pto Gang uly</i>	<i>Mai n acc use d and na mel y in FIR</i>
2	<i>MD M</i>	<i>State Bank of India A/c No.00 00003 83529 7834</i>	<i>03.05. 2019 to 30.03. 2020</i>	<i>15, 63, 946/- Recei ved by the prese nt petiti oner Pardi pto Gang uly from MDM</i>	<i>Pardi pto Gang uly</i>	<i>Mai n acc use d and na mel y in FIR</i>

3	M D M	Stand ard Chart ered Bank Gurug ram A/c No.53 10512 1597	26.11. 2020 to 15.09 .2022	83,25,000/ Received by the Minirva Ganguly from MDM	Minir wa Gang uly	Wife of Pardi pto Gang uly
4	M D M	Stand Chart ered Bank Gurug ram A/c No.53 10512 1597	13.11. 2019 to 14.11. 2021	2,00,90,00 0 /- Received by the Monish Mittal from MDM	Moni sh Mittal	Main accu sed & nam ely in FIR
5	M D M	Stand ard Chart ered Bank Gurug ram A/c No.53 10512 1597 & A/c No.53 10512 2593 & SBI A/c	12.11. 2021 to 22.11. 2021	71,80,000/-	Dyna mic Sales	Com pany of co- accu sed Moni sh Mittal

		No.00 00003 83529 78341				
6	M D M	SBI A/c No.00 00003 83529 78341	22.05 .2019 to 22.08 .2019	67,00,000/-	A.R Asso ciate s	Relat ive of co- accu sed Moni sh Mittal
7	M D M	Stand ard Chart ered Bank Gurug rum A/c No.53 10512 1597	06.08 .2020 to 06.10 .2022	2,00,000/-	Push pak Gang uly	Broth er of co- accu sed Pardi pto Gang uly
8	M D M	Stand ard Chart ered Bank Gurug rum A/c No.53 10512 1597	16.05 .2020 to 16.10 .2020	18,00,000/-	Nidhi Hasij a	Relat ive of co- accu sed Deep ak Nakr a

	<i>M D M</i>	<i>Stand ard Chart ered Bank Gurug rum A/c No.53 10512 1597 & A/c No.53 10512 2534 & A/c No.00 00003 83529 78341</i>	<i>20.10 .2020 to 06.10 .2022</i>	<i>11,59,742/-</i>	<i>Ashis h Sang wan</i>	<i>Previ ous Direc tor of MDM Com pany & frien d of coac cuse d Deep ak Nakr a</i>
	<i>M D M</i>	<i>Stand ard Chart ered Bank Gurug rum A/c No.53 10512 1597 & SBI A/c No.00 00003 83529 78341</i>	<i>30.04 .2019 to 11.03 .2020</i>	<i>4,43,85,00 0 /-</i>	<i>RVD Sales</i>	<i>Relat ive of co- accu sed Moni sh Mittal</i>

1	M	Standard	03.12.	2,05,61	Vihan	Relative
1	D	rd	2020	,610	Associ	tive
	M	Charter	to	/-	ates	of
		ed	10.09.			co-
		Bank	2022			accu
		Gurugr				sed
		um				Supr
		A/c				iya
		No.531				Nakr
		0512				a
		1597 &				&
		A/co				Ash
		No.531				ok
		0512				Sah
		2534 &				ani
		A/c				
		No.531				
		0512				
		2135 &				
		A/c				
		No.531				
		0512				
		2135				

Sr	Name of companies	Name of Banks and accounts numbers	Time period of transactions	Amount	Name of beneficiary	Relation of accused
----	-------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------	---------------------	---------------------

1	MD M	Stand ard Chart ered Bank Gurug ram A/c No.52 10512 1597	15.06 .2020 to 02.01 .2021	6,00, 000/-	Pardi pto Gang uly	Main accus ed
2	MD M	State Bank of India A/c No.00 00003 83529 783	11.09. 2022 to 20.10 .2022	15,00 ,000/-	Pardi pto Gang uly	Main accus ed
3	MD M	Stand ard Chart ered Bank Gurug ram A/c No.52 10512 1597	26.11. 2020	60,00 ,000/-	Minir wa Gang uly	Wife of Pardip to Gang uly
4	MD M	Stand ard Chart ered Bank	13.10 .2020 to 08.12 .2022	2,00, 33,89 4 /-	Kavit a Enter prise s	Relati ve of Deep ak Nakra ,

		<i>Gurugram A/c No.52 10512 1597, 53105 12213 5 & 53105 12253 4</i>				<i>Supriya Nakra & Ashok Kr. Sahni</i>
5	<i>KAVITA ENTERPRISES</i>	<i>HDFC Bank Udyog Vihar, Gurugram, A/c No.59 20991 01090 66</i>	<i>08.12 .2022</i>	<i>10,00 ,000/-</i>	<i>Deepak Nakra</i>	<i>Main accused</i>
6	<i>MDM</i>	<i>Standard Chartered Bank Gurugram A/c No.52 10512 1597</i>	<i>24.11. 2022</i>	<i>3,00, 00,00 0 /-</i>	<i>TNS Solutions Company</i>	<i>Complainant company in FIR No.60 //23 P.S. Rajpur, Dehradun</i>

							(U.K.)
		M D M	SBI A/c No.000 0038 352977 8341 & others	12.11.2 021 to 13.09. 2022	1,39,50 ,000 /-	Dyna mic Sales	Com pany of co- accu sed Moni sh
		M D M	Standar d Charter ed Bank Gurugr am A/c No.531 0512 2135 & 531051 2253 4	02.12. 2020 to 18.01. 2022	1,09,00 ,000 /-	Vihan Associ ates	Com pany of relati ve of Supri ya Nakr a, Asho k Kum ar Saha ni

14. The argument that the dispute is purely civil in nature inasmuch as goods have not been supplied despite payments having been made, cannot be accepted. The accused company received Rs.2.02 crores from the complainant companies and instead of transferring the same to M/s Realme Mobile Telecommunication India Pvt. Ltd. for supply of material, transferred the same along with various amounts received from other individuals/companies into bank accounts controlled by the petitioners, their co-accused, family members and associates. In fact, when co-accused Monish Mittal was granted regular bail on 19.07.2023, at that time the details of the siphoning off of funds from the bank accounts of the accused company were not available. The same came on record only in the affidavits of the

State filed in March/April, 2024. Therefore, the extent of the fraud has come to light only now. Thus, the offences are *prima facie* established from the material on record. Further, other than the instant FIR, the petitioners are accused in other cases as well. Therefore, their criminal antecedents also do not entitle them to the grant of anticipatory bail.

15. In view of the aforementioned discussion, I find no merit in the present petitions. Therefore, the same stand dismissed.

16. However, the observations made hereinabove are only for the purposes of deciding these bail petitions and the Trial Court is free to adjudicate upon the matter on the basis of the evidence led before it uninfluenced by any such observations made herein.

© All Rights Reserved @ LAWYER E NEWS

*Disclaimer: Always compare with the original copy of judgment from the official website.