

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

CRM-M-45846 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 05.05.2017

Manvinder Singh 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 being an electronic engineer is having vast experience of 40 years in this field. In fact, the complainant lured the petitioner to enter into a partnership with him and in the garb of this partnership, the complainant stole various designs of electronic devices developed by the petitioner. Thereafter, the complainant threw out the petitioner and his son from the business. In fact, the petitioner has been cheated by the complainant whereby he had utilized the technical skills and intellectual property rights of the petitioner without paying anything to the petitioner. The dispute is purely of civil nature which has been given the colour of criminal case in order

to put pressure upon 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 is the main beneficiary and 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 for purchase of machinery/factory for setting up of LED TV manufacturing unit, however, the petitioner in connivance with his son and daughter in-law has duped the complainant, usurped 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.

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 |