

CRM-M-26354-2016

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

CRM-M-26354-2016

Date of Decision: 08.09.2016

Rajesh Kapoor and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. S.K.Garg Narwana, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Ankur Lal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. B.S.Virk, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. S.K.Tripathi, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.149 dated 06.04.2013, registered at Police Station Central Faridabad, District Faridabad, under Sections 420, 506 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State counsel has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State. Mr. S.K.Tripathi, Advocate has appeared and filed power of attorney on behalf of the complainant. Same is taken on record. Learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant have contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners; learned State

CRM-M-26354-2016

counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR, in the present case, has been registered on the basis of application submitted by complainant, Dharam Parkash Gupta. As per the allegations, the accused induced the complainant to invest money in property and kept on saying that heavy profit would be given to him. It is the case of the prosecution that an amount of ₹1,15,00,000/- was given by the complainant and it was told to him that booth No.4, Sector-19 and Kothi No.144, Sector 17, Faridabad are to be purchased and the money will be invested. However, later on, the complainant came to know that the accused have sold these properties. Keeping in view the allegations of the prosecution, I find that the petitioners are required for custodial interrogation.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioners are entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

08.09.2016

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No