

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-40092-2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-20.09.2018.

Gurjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Hakam Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab assisted by
ASI Chaman Lal.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

In this petition, petitioner has sought for anticipatory bail in FIR No.154 dated 03.08.2018 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 420/120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Nathana District Bathinda (Punjab) under the provisions of Section 438 Cr.P.C.

2.) Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there was no specific allegations with reference to ingredients like dates and events to the extent of on what date transaction of sum of Rs.20,00,000/- was paid to the petitioner. Further it is submitted that petitioner is prepared to join the investigation.

3.) On the other hand, learned counsel for the State-respondent on instructions from ASI Chaman Lal pointed out from para 5 of the order of the Sessions Court dated 06.09.2018 wherein dates and events have been

culled out relating to payment made to the petitioner on various dates. That apart it was submitted that petitioner is involved in yet another FIR No.95 dated 18.05.2017 relating to the same allegations. Even in the FIR, complainant has pointed out that petitioner has cheated one Nachhattar Singh, resident of Village Lehra Bega, Tehsil and District Bathinda.

4.) Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

5.) Perusal of the records, it is evident that there are serious allegations against the petitioner in respect of cheating complainant and others relating to sending them abroad (USA) through Jakarta (Indonesia). In fact complainant had suffered mental agony as he has sent from India to Jakarta (Indonesia). At Jakarta certain transaction relating to conversion of Indian rupees into US Dollars was also made at the instance of the accused for a sum of Rs.2 lacs. Petitioner is also involved in FIR No.95 dated 18.05.2017 relating to similar allegations like duping certain persons while assuring them to send them to abroad. In view of these facts and circumstances, it seems that petitioner is a habitual offender in respect of cheating general public with assurance that they will be sent abroad for the purpose of work. Moreover, the recovery of huge amount is involved for which petitioner is required for custodial interrogation so also to verify the facts of the case. Accordingly, petitioner has not made out a case.

6.) Petition stands dismissed.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

September 20, 2018.

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.