

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25788-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 28.08.2018

**Dilpreet Singh**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab**

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

Present: Mr. Vijay Rana, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sidakmeet Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. I.S. Chawla, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J.**

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.104 dated 28.03.2018 under Sections 406, 420, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Sahnewal, Tehsil & District Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations in the FIR, the complainant has allegedly paid an amount of Rs.3.00 lacs to the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner had never assured the complainant to send him abroad and the main allegations are against co-accused Kulwinder Kaur and her husband Billa.

In reply, learned State counsel, on instructions from HC Jatinder Kumar, has submitted that co-accused Kulwinder Kaur has already been

arrested and there are direct allegations against the petitioner that a sum of Rs.2.00 lacs was paid by the complainant to the petitioner and the complainant has also handed over the passport to him. Thereafter, again on demand, an amount of Rs.1.00 lac was paid to the present petitioner, as he had represented that the same is required for obtaining the viza to travel to Canada.

Learned counsel appearing for the complainant has submitted that the petitioner had neither returned the amount nor the passport and has given a cheque of Rs.2.50 lacs on 09.01.2017, which was subsequently dishonoured, which shows that the petitioner, from the very beginning, had an intention to cheat the complainant.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, I find no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as from the bare perusal of the FIR, it is apparent that the complainant has handed over an amount of Rs.3.00 lacs to the petitioner, on allurement that petitioner will provide visa for Canada and has obtained his passport. The petitioner, at a later stage, acknowledging the same, had even issued a cheque, which was dishonoured, therefore, considering the serious allegations in the FIR, it is a case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

Dismissed.

[ ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN ]  
JUDGE

28.08.2018  
*vishnu*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable:       | Yes/No |