

CRM-M-34893-2015

[1]

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh.

CRM-M-34893-2015

Date of Decision:19.10.2015

Surinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Ashwani Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SABINA, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.794, dated 12.08.2015, under Sections 420, 406 and 506 of Indian Penal code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sadar Hisar.

Prosecution story, in brief, is that the son of the complainant had applied for a job as a fireman in the Indian Army. Petitioner had assured the complainant that he could get the job for the son of the complainant on payment of ₹10,00,000/-. Complainant paid ₹3,00,000/- in the last week of March 2012 to the petitioner and another sum of ₹2,00,000/- after 5/6 months. Complainant deposited an amount of ₹4,38,000/- in the Bank account of the petitioner. Son of the complainant appeared for physical test for the job

CRM-M-34893-2015

[2]

of fireman on 03.04.2012 and thereafter appeared in the written test. In April 2015, complainant came to know that his son had not been given the job. Complainant approached the petitioner for return of the amount but the same was not returned by the petitioner. Rather the complainant was threatened with dire consequences by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in fact petitioner had given ₹7,00,000/- to the complainant by way of loan. When the petitioner demanded the repayment of the loan amount from the complainant, he has been falsely involved in this case. In fact complainant had deposited part of the loan amount in the account of the petitioner.

In the present case, allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the prosecution case, petitioner had taken ₹9,38,000/- from the complainant with a promise that son of the complainant would be got appointed as a fireman in the Indian Army. However, the needful was not done. The amount paid by the complainant to the petitioner has also not been returned. Petitioner might be required for custodial interrogation.

Dismissed.

October 19, 2015
kapil

(SABINA)
JUDGE