

**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh**

**212**

**CRM-M-7325-2020 (O & M)**

**Date of Decision: July 20, 2020**

**SUKHWINDER SINGH**

**.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**UNION TERRITORY CHANDIGARH**

**....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Ashsish Pal Kaushal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Lalit Kumar Gupta, Advocate for U.T. Chandigarh.

\*\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J (ORAL)**

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.395 dated 02.11.2019, under Sections 420, 120-B IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Sector-39, Chandigarh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations in the FIR had been levelled against the petitioner and one Tilak Raj as having taken money from the complainant to get him employment in Dubai. However, the complainant could not get a job in Dubai and had to return back. He also contends that the complainant had also paid money to one Tilak Raj with whom he has compromised but he is persisting with the case against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for over 08 months and is not involved in any other criminal case.

Learned State counsel, however, contends that a total sum of ₹2,70,000/- was paid in the account of the petitioner which includes ₹2,20,000/- as bank transfer and ₹50,000/- through cheque; besides, other amounts in cash.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he had also paid money to Tilak Raj but without prejudice to his rights and contentions, the petitioner is ready to deposit a demand draft for an amount of ₹2,70,000/- before the trial Court which may be subject to the final outcome of the trial.

Learned State counsel upon instructions from SI Kuldeep Singh contends that although the challan has been filed but none of the 16 prosecution witnesses has been examined.

Heard through video conferencing.

In view of the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, especially when the petitioner is in custody for over 08 months, he is not involved in any other case, Covid 19 pandemic and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, the petitioner shall deposit a demand draft for a sum of ₹2,70,000/- in the trial Court which would be subject to the final outcome of the trial within one month from today.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 20, 2020**  
A.Kaundal

|                            |   |        |
|----------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable         | : | Yes/No |