

Sr. No. 211

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

**CRM No. M-9268 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 04.05.2016**

Baldev Raj

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Vikram Anand, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. D.S.Virk, AAG, Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA. J (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks concession of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.18 dated 09.02.2016, under Sections 406/420 of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Division No.4, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar City.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

Briefly, it may be noticed that FIR came to be registered at the instance of one Vishal.

Complainant has asserted that a sum of Rs.6,50,000/- has been entrusted to the present petitioner who was working as a travel agent as also an associate, namely, Pooja to facilitate the complainant going abroad on a work permit/visa to Cyprus.

It is also the accusation made by the complainant that certain visa documents were furnished to him by the petitioner and

which were found to be fake and forged.

During the course of hearing today, learned State counsel apprises the Court that after receiving the complaint and during the course of an inquiry being conducted in the matter, statement of the petitioner was recorded on 30.08.2015 wherein he accepted the entrustment of money to him by the complainant and further stated that such money had in turn been given to another travel agent and that he would return the money to the complainant only upon receiving back such money from the other travel agent.

The recording of such statement made by the petitioner before the Investigating Agency is not disputed by the counsel appearing for the petitioner.

In the light of such serious allegations wherein innocent persons are duped of hard earned money on the pretext of selling a foreign dream, this Court is not inclined to extend in favour of the petitioner the concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition dismissed.

It is clarified that the observations contained in this order are confined only as regards considering the prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail and would have no bearing on the merits of the case.

04.05.2016

vandana

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**