

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

CRM No.M-46143 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: May 29, 2019

Rahul Vij

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Nishant Sharma, Advocate for
Mr.Hitesh Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Atul Goyal, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

CRM No.38453 of 2018

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed.

Section 354 IPC is added in the headnote and prayer part of the
petition. Registry is directed to make necessary correction in the headnote
and prayer part of the petition.

CRM No.M-46143 of 2018

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for
grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.258 dated 30.08.2018 under

Sections 420 and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Division No.8,

Ludhiana.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

The perusal of the record shows that serious allegations against the present petitioner have been levelled by the complainant, who was employee in the same office, where petitioner was Branch Manager. As per the allegations, the present petitioner has cheated the complainant by influencing her to marry etc. The offence under Section 354 IPC has also been added in this case.

At the time of arguments, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant contended that there are other complaints against the present petitioner regarding cheating etc. More than ₹2 lakhs is stated to have been deposited in the account of the petitioner.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of the nature and gravity of the offence, I find that petitioner is required for custodial interrogation and no ground is made out for grant of benefit of anticipatory bail to him.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

May 29, 2019
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No