

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

**CRM M-12258 of 2018**

**Date of decision : 22.05.2018**

Chandru Pagrani @ Chandru Thakur Dass Pagrani

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

**BEFORE : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.A. Pathak, Additional A.G. Punjab.

**RAJAN GUPTA J.**

Petitioner seeks concession of pre-arrest bail in a case registered against him under sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC vide FIR No. 158 dated 05.09.2017 at police station Division no. 8, Jalandhar. It has been urged before the court that matter is purely civil in nature and no offence under sections 406, 420 IPC is made out against the petitioner. According to learned counsel, petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. Thus, he is entitled to concession of pre-arrest bail. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that allegations against the petitioner are serious. According to him, recovery is yet to be effected from the petitioner.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and given careful thought to the facts of the case.

FIR was registered on the basis of complaint made by Rohit Sehgal. He stated that he was doing the business of readymade garments. In the month of October 2016 petitioner alongwith his partner placed an order

of the readymade garments and assured the complainant that payment would be made on receipt of the consignment at their business office at Dubai. However, after receiving the goods, petitioner refused to make the payment. After registration of FIR, investigation ensued. Same is pending. It is evident that allegations against the petitioner are serious. He promised the complainant that payment shall be made immediately on receipt of the goods. However, after receipt of consignment, he refused to make the payment. In this manner, he is alleged to have deceived the complainant.

Keeping in view facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that recovery is yet to be effected, I am of the considered view that no case for grant of pre-arrest bail is made out. Investigation has to be taken to its logical end for which custodial interrogation may be necessary. Petition is, thus, without any merit and is dismissed.

May 22, 2018

*Ajay*

(RAJAN GUPTA)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No