

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

101

**CRM-M-21978-2021(O&M)
Date of Order:28.06.2021**

AVTAR SINGH ALIAS RINKU BHATIA

..Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Bhupinder Banga, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Mehta, Sr. DAG, Punjab

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

The hearing of the case was held through video conferencing on account of restricted functioning of the Courts.

This is the 3rd application for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in a criminal case arising from FIR No.0068, dated 21.07.2018, registered under Section 420 IPC, at Police Station Ghuman, District Batala, Punjab.

The first petition was dismissed on 01.09.2020, with the following order:-

“The petitioner prays for grant of pre-arrest bail in a criminal case arising from FIR No.0068, dated 21.07.2018, registered under Section 420 IPC, at Police Station Ghuman, District Batala.

As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner is working as a travel agent and had agreed to help the first informant's son to migrate to Cyprus on payment of Rs.7,00,000/-. However, after receipt of the amount, neither the petitioner sent the first informant's son to Cyprus nor paid back the amount.

As per the order passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, the petitioner is also involved in other similar cases.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Palwinder Singh, has submitted that as many as 4

similar cases, containing similar allegations, are pending against the petitioner. He further informed the court that the petitioner is working as a travel agent, having office at Hoshiarpur.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this court is not inclined to grant concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.”

The second petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed on 17.02.2021, with the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner wishes to withdraw the present petition with liberty to avail of any other appropriate remedy.

Dismissed as withdrawn with liberty aforesaid.”

Learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that the first informant after having entered into an agreement/settlement, is now back tracking from the same. He further submits that the first informant has already received more than 3,00,000/- from the petitioner.

Be that as it may.

Two previous petitions, as noticed above, have already been dismissed. Learned counsel representing the petitioner admits that the first informant does not honour the alleged settlement.

In view of the aforesaid facts, this court is not inclined to grant the pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

June 28, 2021
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No