

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-2841 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 27.01.2016

Parminder Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.**

Present:- Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J**

The petitioner seeks concession of pre-arrest bail in case F.I.R. No.88 dated 2.6.2015 under sections 406, 420, 120-B I.P.C and section 12 of the Passport Act, registered at Police Station, Bhogpur, District Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

Complainant in the present case is Surjit Singh son of Dhanna Singh. Allegations against the present petitioner as also co-accused Mangal Singh and Bakshish Singh are with regard to having entered into a deal for a sum of Rs.22 lacs to facilitate sending son of the complainant to a foreign land.

Further allegations are that a sum of Rs.8 lacs was paid and son of the complainant having not been sent abroad and even the money being demanded back, the petitioner and co-accused furnished fake tickets and visa.

Apparently, upon a complaint having been made, even a compromise dated 31.7.2015 is stated to have been effected for a sum of Rs.8 lacs. As per such settlement a sum of Rs.2 lacs initially was to be returned and such compromise is stated to have been written by the present

petitioner in his own handwriting. Complainant has alleged that even such compromise has not been honored.

Counsel for the petitioner/accused would vehemently urge that in pursuance to the complaint having been filed, the police authorities had only picked-up the petitioner and had got his signatures affixed on certain blank papers and which is being given the shape of a compromise.

The allegations against the petitioner are very serious in nature. Innocent farmers and the unemployed youth of the State are being sold a foreign dream.

Even the submission with regard to blank papers having been got signed by the investigating agency does not seem probable. The compromise is stated to have been effected on 31.7.2014. Petitioner, thereafter, till the date of registration of the present F.I.R i.e. 2.6.2015 has not even raised his little finger to bring to the notice of the authorities concerned that he had been forced to enter into a settlement.

Under such circumstances, this Court does not find any infirmity in the order dated 31.7.2015, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar declining the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

Petition, accordingly, is dismissed.

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)**  
**JUDGE**

**27.01.2016**  
lucky