

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

**CRM-M-45376-2017 (O&M)**

**Date of decision:06.03.2018**

Gaurav Soni

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. G.S. Madaan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sidakmeet Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the complainant.

...

**TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL).**

The instant petition was preferred under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.160, dated 13.09.2017, under Sections 406/420 IPC, registered at Police Station Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

Allegations in a nutshell are that the complainant has been duped of a total sum of Rs.9 lakhs approximately on the pretext of his son being sent abroad.

Insofar as the present petitioner is concerned, he is alleged to have introduced the complainant to a travel agent.

As per complainant's version, an amount of Rs.3 lakhs approximately was deposited in the account of the present petitioner and the remaining Rs.6 lakhs was entrusted to the travel agent/co-accused.

Receipt of Rs.3 lakhs in the account of the petitioner and by way of deposit at the hands of the complainant is not disputed.

The instant petition came up for preliminary hearing before a Coordinate Bench of this Court on 07.12.2017 and at that stage, counsel for the petitioner had stated that an amount of Rs.1 lakh would be deposited in Court within a period of one week. Such statement was accepted and petitioner was granted interim protection subject to his joining investigation.

On a subsequent date of hearing i.e. on 15.12.2017, counsel for the petitioner stated that he would hand over a demand draft of Rs.1 lakh to the complainant within two weeks and the balance amount would also be paid by the next date of hearing.

Accordingly, hearing was deferred to 29.01.2018.

On 29.01.2018, undertaking of counsel representing the petitioner was recorded to the effect that a sum of Rs.1 lakh by way of demand draft in the name of the complainant would be furnished on the adjourned date.

During the resumed hearing today, counsel for the petitioner pleads no instructions. The undertaking duly recorded on the previous date of hearing i.e. on 29.01.2018 has not been met with and the demand draft of Rs.1 lakh has not been furnished.

Conduct of the petitioner dis-entitles him from the concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition is dismissed.

**06.03.2018**

*harjeet*

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)  
JUDGE**

- |     |                            |        |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable?        | Yes/No |