

**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh**

PARAMJIT KAUR SAINI  
2015.01.15 17:50  
I attest to the accuracy and  
authenticity of this document

**CRM-M-30603 of 2014**

**Date of Decision: 13.01.2015**

**Pawan Karwal**

**---Petitioner**

**versus**

**State of Punjab**

**---Respondent**

**Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate  
for the petitioner  
Mr. Gazi Mohammad, DAG, Punjab  
for the respondent-State

\*\*\*

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

\*\*\*

**REKHA MITTAL, J.**

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has already joined investigation in compliance with interim bail granted by this Court and his custodial interrogation is not required.

Counsel for the State of Punjab, on the other hand, submits that Navjeet Kumar complainant and Vipin Kumar paid an amount of Rs. 4,50,000/- on the representation made by the accused to send them to Singapore and provide them work in a poultry farm. It is further argued that the aforesaid persons went to Singapore but they were not provided with work in a poultry farm but were asked to work in a butcher farm. It is further submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the money paid by the victims.

In reply, counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the FIR got registered by the complainant, he has levelled allegations against the petitioner and one Dr. Anil Kumar Sharma, the non-applicant/co-accused, who was exonerated and declared innocent during investigation. The complainant and Vipin Kumar went to Singapore but did not find job to their liking and for that reason they have come back. They were provided with details of their job vide letter Annexure P-2 wherein it was specifically mentioned that they should check their employment details before they leave. The last submission made by counsel is that the petitioner is ready to face proceedings in accordance with law.

Keeping in view the fact that the complainant and his associate were given due notice to check the nature of employment to be provided to them and their visa for Singapore was arranged and they actually visited Singapore but did not find the job being offered to be in consonance with promise made, without meaning to express any opinion on merits of the controversy, interim bail granted to the petitioner is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

**(REKHA MITTAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**13.01.2015**  
PARAMJIT