

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4198/2022

Praveen Giri Son Of Shri Arjun Giri, R/o Parikri Marg, Pushkar,
Kishangarh, Ajmer, Raj. Through Director Vaigvat Marketing Pvt.
Ltd. Company.

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Public Prosecutor

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Kuldeep Aswal
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Rajendra Yadav GA Cum AAG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARENDRA SINGH DHADDHA

Order

29/07/2022

1. The present bail application has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in connection with FIR No.680/2021 registered at Police Station Chomu, Jaipur (West) for the offence under Sections 420, 406 of IPC.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been wrongly implicated in this case. He had joined the investigation as per direction of this court. Nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. Petitioner is employee of the Company. Co-accused Ramswoop was enlarged on bail u/s 439 Cr.P.C by this Court. So, the petitioner be enlarged on anticipatory bail.
3. Learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner and submitted that petitioner was Co-Director in Vegvat Marketing Private Limited

Company. Petitioner and other co-accused had taken money from the complainant and other persons and assured them to repay the money with the huge profit but they failed to return money taken by the complainant and other persons. So, looking to the gravity of offence, anticipatory bail application be dismissed.

4. I have considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Public Prosecutor.

5. It is an admitted position that petitioner is Co-Director of Vegvat Marketing Private Limited Company. Petitioner and other co-accused had taken huge money from the complainant and other persons by giving assurance that they will return the money with same profit but they had not returned the original amount of the complainant and other persons. So, looking to the gravity of offence, I do not consider it a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

6. Hence, anticipatory bail application stands dismissed.

(NARENDRA SINGH DHADDHA),J

Brijesh 28.

