

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

**CRM-M-6442-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 11.02.2021**

Bodh Raj @ Raj Bhatia

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present : Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

This is the second petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 198 dated 07.11.2019 under Sections 420 and 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station Tibba, District Ludhiana, Punjab.

The first petition, bearing CRM-M-3652-2021, was disposed of on 27.01.2021 granting liberty to petitioner to surrender before the trial Court within a period of seven days from passing of the order and it was directed that in case he moves a regular bail application before the trial Court, the same shall be decided expeditiously, preferably within a period of three days thereafter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to reargue the entire case on the grounds which were available to petitioner when his aforesaid first petition was disposed of. Though the same is not permissible, however, it is noticed that as per allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of complainant Lovepreet Singh, the petitioner and co-accused approached the complainant to provide him a job in Railway Department and demanded Rs.5,00,000/- and out of the same, an amount of Rs.2,00,000/- was paid on different dates and in the intervening

period, there was a telephonic conversation between the complainant and the petitioner.

It is further stated in the FIR that the victim was also taken to Bihar for completing certain formalities and on that pretext, again some money was taken from the complainant and in total Rs.5,00,000/- was taken from the complainant. However, later on, the complainant came to know that a fraud has been played on him by the petitioner and other accused.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab, who is also appearing through video conferencing, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer on the ground that the custodial investigation is received as there are direct allegations against the petitioner and the complainant has given details of the amount along with dates when it was given to the petitioner and other accused.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering the serious allegations against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant him concession of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

11.02.2021

Waseem/Chetan

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No