

202

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.17518 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: 15.09.2020

Satpal Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. K.L. Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

Prayer in this 2nd petition for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.187 dated 24.11.2019 under Sections 406/420 IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulations) Act, 2014, registered at Police Station City Nawanshahr, District SBS Nagar; earlier one was dismissed on merits vide order dated 13.02.2020.

On 08.07.2020, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that new ground is that the petitioner wants to settle the dispute with the complainant and out of the disputed amount of Rs.5.00 lacs, he is ready to deposit an amount of Rs.2.00 lacs with the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate within a period of two months from today to show his bonafide and explore the possibility of settlement.

Notice of motion for 14.09.2020.

In case the petitioner deposit the amount of Rs.2.00 lacs with the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate within a period of two months from today, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed subject to the conditions envisaged under

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Now, the petitioner has moved an application for extension of time on the ground that because of poor health, he could not comply with the order dated 08.07.2020.

Counsel for the State has raised serious objection with regard to the conduct of the petitioner and submit that on 06 occasions, written notice was given to the petitioner, which was duly served upon the petitioner, however, he has flatly refused to come and join the investigation and one DDR was also registered on that pretext.

As per the allegations in the FIR, the complainant Sandeep Kaur made a statement that she knew one Abhay Jain, who had a shop under the name and style of Shila Garments and the complainant and her husband become friendly with Abhay Jain, who told them that his uncle Satpal can send both of them to Canada and on that pretext, the complainant paid a sum of Rs.5 lacs to Satpal Singh. Later on, despite various assurances given and by taking the complainant to Calcutta for the purpose of arranging Visa, but neither the Visa was arranged nor tickets were provided.

Counsel for the State has further argued that during the investigation, it has come that for sending the Sandeep Kaur, her husband and 02 children to Canada, a total amount of Rs.19.05 lacs was paid by the complainant, however, the petitioner fail to comply with the same.

Counsel for the State has further submitted that the allegations against the wife of the petitioner Mona Rani are on different count as the primary allegations are against the petitioner, who was an

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

agent of SOTC and even, some more complaints are pending against him in Mansa and Barnala.

After hearing the counsel for the parties and considering the conduct of the petitioner, who has failed to join the investigation, I find no ground to entertain this petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

15.09.2020
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No