

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

**CRM No.M-29191 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: October 12, 2018**

Manohar Lal

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Sarju Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.82 dated 25.05.2018 under Sections 406 and 420 IPC, registered at Police Station City Nawanshahr, District SBS Nagar.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that on the last date, learned counsel for the petitioner and complainant-Sapna were present in the Court and they stated that a compromise has been effected between the parties and learned counsel for the petitioner, handed over ₹30,000/- in cash to complainant

Sapna Kumari. He also submitted that as per compromise, the petitioner

will pay ₹30,000/- more to the complainant on or before the next date of hearing. Today, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner has not contacted him and admittedly, ₹30,000/- more has not been paid to the complainant as per the compromise.

As per the allegations in the FIR, petitioner has taken ₹60,000/- from the complainant on the pretext of providing her job in the Income Tax Department. As per order dated 25.06.2018 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, SBS Nagar, the petitioner earlier also entered into agreement/compromise dated 10.10.2017 and promised to pay ₹60,000/- to the complainant on 18.10.2017 but did not pay the same. Then, the petitioner gave cheque of ₹60,000/- on 21.11.2017, which was dishonoured due to insufficient funds. Now, before this Court also, the petitioner also promised to pay the remaining amount of ₹30,000/- but he had not paid the same. As per record, there is one more FIR against the petitioner on similar allegations.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of the fact that conduct of the petitioner is of such a nature, which dis-entitles him for grant of benefit of anticipatory bail, I do not find any merit in the present petition.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

The order dated 16.07.2018 granting interim bail to the petitioner stands vacated.

October 12, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No