

CRM-M-14623 of 2020

**205IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-14623 of 2020
Date of Decision: 07.10.2020

Sukhjinder Singh @ Soni

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present:- Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Jagmohan Ghumman, DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Case taken up through Video Conferencing.

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. the petitioner seeks the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.45 dated 21.04.2020, registered under Section 420 IPC and Section 13 of the Punjab Travels Profession (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Begowal, District Kapurthala.

The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner had taken an amount of ₹2.5 lakhs for sending the complainant's son to Malaysia and for getting a work permit for him over there. However, though the complainant's son was sent to Malaysia, no work permit was granted to him and consequently, he returned to India after 13 days.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the son-in-law of the petitioner's uncle namely, Gunveer Singh, who is a travel agent had sent the complainant's son to Malaysia; because the petitioner had twice

CRM-M-14623 of 2020

remained Panch of the village he has been falsely implicated in the case to pressurize Gunveer Singh to return the money allegedly paid to Gunveer Singh; there is no other criminal case in which the petitioner is involved and that under the interim orders passed by this Court the petitioner has not only joined the investigation but has also fully co-operated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Daljit Singh admits to the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and that under the interim orders passed by this Court the petitioner has not only joined the investigation but has also fully co-operated with the investigating agency. He further submits that the State does not require the custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

After considering the totality of the above facts this Court is of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary and consequently the order of this Court dated 10.06.2020 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is ordered to be made absolute.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

October 07, 2020
R.S.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No