

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

CRM-M-20211-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision : 03.09.2019

Vinod Kohli

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate for
Mr. S.S. Sarwara, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate for the complainant.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.32 dated 17.01.2019 registered under Sections 420/406 IPC at Police Station City Jagadhri, District Yamuna Nagar.

Notice was issued in the bail application. After taking repeated adjournments, on 03.07.2019, counsel for the petitioner had undertaken to pay the amount of ₹15,00,000/- by 31.07.2019 to the complainant. Order dated 03.07.2019 passed by this Court, is extracted as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner requests for short adjournment. He undertakes that petitioner would pay a sum of ₹15,00,000/- by 31.07.2019 to the complainant.

Adjourned to 16.08.2019.

Needless to mention that if the amount is not paid, the interim protection granted to the petitioner shall stands vacated.”

Thereafter on 13.08.2019, application for extension of time to pay the amount was filed and the same was disposed of by following order:-

“On 03.07.2019, learned counsel for the petitioner had undertaken that petitioner would pay a sum of ₹15,00,000/- by 31.07.2019 to the complainant.

Through the present application, prayer has been made to extend the time on the ground that the bank account of the petitioner has been seized by the Income Tax Department.

No date of seizure of the bank account has been given in the application, whether such seizure is before 03.07.2019 when the undertaking was given or thereafter. In any case, petitioner is allowed time only upto 31.08.2019 failing which the order dated 03.07.2019 would operate.

List on 02.09.2019.”

Today also position is no different. Petitioner once again prays for further time. The allegations against the petitioner are that he had agreed to fabricate a poly house for a farmer and received approximately ₹80,00,000/-. However, poly house was not fabricated. The relief of pre-arrest bail is discretionary. Such relief is to be granted only in exceptional cases. In the present case, conduct of the petitioner dis-entitles him to such relief. Hence, the present petition is dismissed.

03.09.2019

Pawan

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No