

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

**Crl. Misc. No. M-1104 of 2015
Date of Decision: 13.1.2015.**

Bhupinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

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

SABINA, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 136 dated 2.10.2014 under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station 'B' Division, District Amritsar.

As per the prosecution case, complainant was introduced to the petitioner. Petitioner demanded ₹ 7,50,000/- from the complainant for sending his son to United Kingdom. The matter was settled at ₹ 6,50,000/-. Complainant handed over ₹ 3,00,000/- to the petitioner and the petitioner also obtained signatures of the son of the complainant on some blank papers in March 2013. After one month, petitioner again demanded another sum of ₹ 2,00,000/- from the complainant. The said amount was paid by the complainant to the petitioner after borrowing the same from his relatives and by pledging jewellery. Thereafter, another sum of ₹ 1,50,000/- was paid by the complainant to the petitioner.

However, son of the complainant was neither sent abroad nor the amount in question was returned to the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner has been falsely involved in this case. As per the complaints Annexures P-2 and P-3, allegations had been levelled against Sukhdev Singh. Learned counsel has further submitted that letter Annexure P-1 was issued in the name of the son of the complainant. The cheque in question had been handed over by the petitioner to the complainant by way of security.

In the present case, allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the prosecution case, petitioner took money from the complainant for sending his son to United Kingdom. However, the son of the complainant was neither sent to United Kingdom nor the amount in question has been returned to the complainant. The evidentiary value of Annexures P-2 and P-3 will be seen during trial. Petitioner might be required for custodial interrogation.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

January 13, 2015
Gurpreet