

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.17588 of 2021(O&M)

Date of Decision.15.09.2021

(Heard through VC)

Raj Singh Chahal

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. S.K. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Dharambir Bhargav, Advocate
for the complainant.

-.-

JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)

1. This is second bail application that has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.002 dated 04.01.2021 under Sections 406, 420 IPC registered at Police Station, Sector 9, Ambala City, District Ambala.

2. In brief, the allegations as set out in the FIR are that the petitioner herein namely Raj Singh Chahal had duped the complainant of Rs.5 lakhs by promising employment. It was alleged that Raj Singh Chahal had asked for Rs.10 lakhs in order to be able to provide a government job by portraying that he had full recognition in the BJP Government. It was ultimately agreed that an amount of Rs.7 lakhs would be paid and Raj Singh Chahal, the petitioner took documents from the complainant and also took an amount of Rs.2 lakhs as advance. Thereafter another amount of Rs.1 lakh was taken in cash and remaining amount of Rs.2 lakhs was given by way of a cheque No.203964 dated 11.11.2019. The result by the Haryana Staff

Selection Commission for appointment to the post of Civil Engineer was declared and the name of the complainant was not in the select list. Thereafter, the petitioner was asked to return the money, which he failed to do. In the month of August, Raj Singh gave a cheque dated 17.09.2020 amounting Rs.2 lakhs, however, the same was dishonoured.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that false allegations have been made against the petitioner, who has no role to play in the alleged offence as the petitioner has no link with BJP. The talks of getting a job was between father of the complainant, complainant and one Surinder Dogra, while arguing that transaction of Rs.2 lakhs was a friendly loan and therefore, the matter is that of a civil nature.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant would vehemently argue that the petitioner herein holds an important post in BJP.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties. Admittedly, this is second bail application as the first one was dismissed as withdrawn. There are no changes in circumstances to warrant interference by this Court in the second bail application. Even otherwise, there is no explanation forthcoming as to why a cheque given by the petitioner herein for a sum of Rs.2 lakhs was dishonoured. Resultantly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

September 15, 2021
Pankaj*

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