

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

CRM-M-5678-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision:03.05.2018

Lalit Kumar Singla

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Robin S. Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak K. Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL).

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.01, dated 02.01.2018, under Sections 406/420/467/468/471/120-B/506 IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Sonipat, District Sonipat.

Briefly noticed, allegations leading to registration of the FIR are that the present petitioner as also his brother, namely, Sanjiv Singla have duped the complainant of a total sum of Rs.36 lakhs approximately on the pretext of securing admission of son of the complainant in a medical college.

The instant petition came up for preliminary hearing before this Court on 15.03.2018 and a categorical submission advanced by counsel was duly recorded to the effect that it is a case of false implication and no amount was deposited either in the account of the petitioner or his brother, namely, Sanjiv Singla.

Based on such contention, notice of motion was issued and ad

interim protection as regards arrest was also granted subject to the petitioner joining investigation.

Learned State counsel, who is on instructions from ASI Kuldeep Singh apprises the Court that in fact an amount of Rs.11,05,000/- had been deposited from the complainant side and in the account of the present petitioner, namely, Lalit Kumar Singla. Assertion made by learned State counsel has not met with any rebuttal by counsel representing the petitioner. Rather deposit of such amount is conceded during the course of hearing today.

What clearly emerges is that a factually incorrect statement had been made before this Court on 15.03.2018.

The statement in question was the very basis of issuance of notice of motion as also for grant of interim protection.

Petitioner is guilty of having made an attempt to hoodwink this Court.

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

Petition is dismissed.

03.05.2018*harjeet***(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)****JUDGE**

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