

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32644-2015

Date of Decision: September 23, 2015

Amarjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present: Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

NARESH KUMAR SANGHI, J (Oral)

Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 438, Cr.P.C., is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, Amarjit Singh, son of Lal Singh, resident of village Jogna Khera, Tehsil Thanesar, District Kurukshetra, who has been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 489, 489-A, 489-B, 489-C and 506, IPC, in a case arising out of FIR No. 606, dated 11.8.2015, registered at Police Station, City, Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel contends that the FIR in question was registered on the basis of the order passed by learned Area Judicial Magistrate under Section 156(3), Cr.P.C.; the Magistrate had not applied its mind before referring the matter to the police for registration of the case; initially the informant, Surjit Kaur, had presented the complaint before the police and the allegations levelled by her were found to be false; and that the main dispute was with regard to sale and purchase of buffaloes, which has been given the colour of a criminal case.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and with

his able assistance gone through the material available on record.

As per the allegations levelled in the FIR by the informant, Surjit Kaur, the petitioner approached her and made her to believe that if she would pay the cash amount, then double of the same would be paid to her. The informant parted a sum of ₹1,45,000/- (Rupees one lac and forty-five thousand only) on 28.1.2015 and 2.2.2015, but the petitioner neither returned the original amount nor paid the amount as promised by him. *Prima facie*, it appears that with an intention to commit cheating and to play fraud with the informant, the petitioner made her to believe that double amount of the amount to be paid by her would be returned. In the considered opinion of the Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would facilitate the investigating agency to bring true facts on record.

No ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)
JUDGE

September 23, 2015
Pkapoor