

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-45345 of 2018
Date of Decision : 13.05.2019

Mukesh Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Ms. Alisha Soni, Advocate for
Mr. Hemant Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabharwal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Amandeep Saini, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Mr. Rajesh Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Sachin Jain, Advocate for Raj Kumar.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J.(Oral)

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 63 dated 21.06.2018 under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station City Fazilka, District Fazilka.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations against the petitioner are that he is stated to have taken an amount of ₹ 1,18,00,000/- from the complainant and others for arranging jobs for them and he had also given forged appointment letters to them. He further contends that in the order dated 12.10.2018 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, it was recorded that in case the liberty of the petitioner was protected, he would repay the amounts received by him. The arrest of the petitioner was stayed. The matter was later on referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court where a compromise is stated to have

arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner has neither paid any amount nor any kind of compromise was finally arrived at with the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for sometime to make the outstanding amount.

Perusal of the file shows that this Court had already granted number of opportunities vide orders dated 4.4.2019, 12.4.2019 and 3.5.2019 to the petitioner to make the payment. However, the petitioner has not made any payment.

Learned State counsel contends that the petitioner has taken huge amount of money not only from the complainant but also from other persons and therefore, his custodial interrogation is necessary.

In view of aforementioned allegations against the petitioner having accepted huge amount of money not only from the complainant but also from others on the pretext of getting jobs for them and despite availing ample opportunities to return the money, he has failed to do so. In these circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, the petition is dismissed.

May 13, 2019
dinesh

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes
Whether reportable? No