

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-3786-2017(O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.03.2018

Munish Aggarwal

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Yadav, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Girotra, Advocate for the complainant.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J (Oral)

Petitioner seeks concession of anticipatory bail in case F.I.R. No.973 dated 20.10.2016 under sections 420, 406 I.P.C, registered at Police Station, Jhajjar, District Jhajjar.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

FIR came to be registered on the complaint of Sahil Deswal. Complainant asserted that he came in contact with the petitioner on the basis of an advertisement issued through internet as regards a business venture in Thailand. The present petitioner was contacted on the mobile phone number furnished in the advertisement itself. Thereafter, complainant and his father proceeded to the residential premises of the petitioner in Ludhiana and whereupon the complainant was introduced to the uncle as also father of the petitioner. A deal was settled at Rs.14 lacs for arranging a business visa in Thailand as also to run a joint business venture in such foreign land. Complainant asserts that he proceeded to Thailand on 10.8.2014 whereupon he met the present petitioner and was shown a

business of running a coffee shop. Thereafter, a sum of Rs.14 lacs was given by father of the complainant. Such money is stated to have been misappropriated and the complainant has been duped of his money as the present petitioner has furnished a visa which is allegedly forged. Thereafter, an assurance was held out that the money would be returned but in spite of repeated requests the money in question has not been returned.

Learned State counsel upon instructions from ASI Rajesh Kumar apprises the Court that during the course of investigation certain banking transactions have been verified and which would partly explain the source of funds for the father of the complainant to have made over to the accused party.

It has also been verified that the mobile phone number furnished in the advertisement was that of the present petitioner i.e. Munish Aggarwal.

Against the backdrop of such serious allegations, a deep and thorough probe would be imperative and which may well entail custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

In view of the discussion herein above, prayer made in the present petition is declined.

Petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

27.03.2018

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No