IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10491-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.04.2021

Jitender Chauhan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Gautam Diwan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Sheoran, DAG Haryana.

****

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

CRM-9572-2021

Prayer in the present application is for placing on record the copies of passport dated 12.09.2017, entry visa dated 07.07.2010, work permit, visit pass from 07.06.2011 to 13.04.2016 and DDR dated 06.07.2016, as Annexures P-7 to P-10.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. Annexure P-7 to P-10 are taken on record.

Main case:

This petition is for quashing of FIR No. 250 dated 29.07.2020

MANGAL SINGH
2021.04.08 16:29
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
chandigarh

registered under Sections 406, 420, 506 IPC and Section 24 of the Emigration Act, 1983, Sections 370 and 120-B IPC were added and Section 506 IPC was deleted vide notice under Section 160 Cr.P.C. dated 09.02.2021, at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal, along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations against the petitioner are totally false and baseless. No work permit was granted to the complainant, rather he went to Malaysia himself on tourist visa. Moreover, at the time of registration of the FIR, the petitioner was not in the Country.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn the attention of this Court towards the FIR No. 261 dated 22.10.2015, registered under Sections 420, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Chankyapuri, New Delhi, wherein the respondent No. 2 is an accused, for fraudulently applying for visa at the German Embassy, which shows respondent No. 2 is a habitual criminal person and is involved in the acts of cheating and fraud.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

The averments made by the learned counsel for the petitioner are the disputed question of fact and law, which cannot be taken into consideration by this Court and no case is made out to interfere in the present case, by this Court.

The petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

07.04.2021
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No
Whether reportable? Yes/No

MANGAL SINGH
2021.04.08 16:29
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
chandigarh