

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.104

CRM-M-35060-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision : 16.08.2018

Varinder Kumar

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. O.S. Batalvi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.126 dated 18.07.2018, registered at Police Station City Batala, under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC.

According to the contents of the FIR, the petitioner introduced the complainant to one Dharam Panesar of Mumbai as the complainant was interested in sending her son abroad. Thereafter, a deal was finalized and a sum of Rs.2.5 lakhs was paid in cash to the petitioner. Further sums were deposited in the account of said Dharam Panesar. However, the son of the complainant was not sent abroad and the money paid was also not returned.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a photostat shop operator in the Court complex at Batala. The complainant met Dharam Panesar and his wife in his shop and apart from that the petitioner has no role in the dealing between the complainant and the said Dharam Panesar. In fact, the petitioner is himself a victim as he has also paid a sum of Rs.3.7 lakhs to Dharam Panesar for going to Germany.

There are specific allegations against the petitioner. A sum of Rs.2.5 lakhs has allegedly been paid in cash to him. At this stage, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has

been falsely implicated, cannot be looked into as there is no material to support the same. From the overall facts and circumstances of this case, there appears to be a link between the petitioner and aforementioned Dharam Panesar, which needs to be unraveled.

For the aforementioned reasons, the petition has no merit and is accordingly, dismissed.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

16.08.2018
Ramandeep Singh
Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes/ No