

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

CRM-M-3760 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 05.05.2017

Manish Chugh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. A.S. Narang, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Atul Lakhanpal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Gagandeep Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition, under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No. 0166 dated 30.08.2016, registered under Sections 420, 406 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Dera Bassi, District SAS Nagar, Mohali.

It is contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case being the son of main accused, Manvinder Chugh. In fact, the petitioner has nothing to do with the present FIR. The dispute is purely of civil nature which has been given the colour of criminal case in order to put pressure upon the family members of the petitioner.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant oppose the bail application and states that the petitioner in connivance with main accused has usurped the

amount given by the complainant. The learned counsel for the complainant further states that from the last three/four dates, the matter was adjourned as the petitioner was ready to compromise the matter, however, now he has backed out from the compromise and has not come to sign the agreement.

Heard.

As per FIR, payment of Rs. 1.06 crore was allegedly made to the petitioner and co-accused for purchase of machinery/factory for setting up of LED TV manufacturing unit, however, the petitioner in connivance other co-accused has duped the amount and transferred the same in their personal accounts. The amount in question is to be recovered. This Court feels that it is a fit case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to know his modus operandi, particularly when he has backed out from the compromise. Keeping in view the above, no case for pre-arrest bail is made out at this stage. Keeping in view the above, no case for pre-arrest bail is made out at this stage.

Dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

05.05.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes	No
Yes	No