

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRL. MISC. No.M-12136 OF 2016**  
**DATE OF DECISION : 22<sup>nd</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2016**

**Vish Chaudhary @ Vishwajeet Chaudhary**

**.... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana**

**.... Respondent**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. B. CHAUDHARI**

\* \* \* \*

Present : Mr. Anurag Singh Tagra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanu Shree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Naveen Chopra, Advocate for the complainant.

\* \* \* \*

**A. B. CHAUDHARI, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.146 dated 23.05.2015 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B IPC (Section 467, 468 and 471 IPC are deleted and Section 506 IPC and Section 3/4 of Immigration Act added later on) at Police Station Butana, District Karnal.

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Perused the reply filed by the Investigating Officer-Deputy Superintendent of Police, Indri (Karnal).

Learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the fact that the petitioner had travelled to Macao along with the victim.

The allegation made by the prosecution is that at Macao huge sum was withdrawn through ATM card from the account of the victim.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though it is true that he had gone along with victim to Macao but then there is no withdrawal of the amount as contended. According to him it is a land dispute which is said to be given colour of criminal offence.

In my opinion, entire matter requires proper investigation, particularly the petitioner admitted that he had gone to Macao along with the victim.

Learned counsel for the complainant as well as learned State counsel submit that the passport and cheque book etc., belonging to the victim, are in custody of the petitioner. However, this fact is denied by the petitioner.

In view of the above, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Therefore, interim order dated 07.04.2016 granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner is rejected.

Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

**22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2016**  
'raj'

**(A. B. CHAUDHARI)**  
**JUDGE**