

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

207

**CRM-M No. 36537 of 2021
Date of decision :22.09.2021**

Monika

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Ajay Singh Ghangas, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Ashok Singh Chaudhary, Addl. AG Haryana.
Mr. Suresh Kumar Kaushik, Advocate for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.

Case is taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 147 dated 20.04.2021 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Kotwali, District Faridabad.

On the last date of hearing, it was contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner along with the co-accused had applied for the Visa of the complainant's wife, but the same was rejected by the Government of Canada and that the petitioner had already returned the substantial amount of Rs.11 lakh to the complainant and had also given four blank signed cheques to the complainant, in lieu of the remaining amount.

Status report filed by way of affidavit dated 14.09.2021 of Assistant Commissioner of Police, NIT, Faridabad, filed in the Registry is taken on record.

Learned State counsel assisted by the counsel for the complainant, has invited the attention of this Court to para No.3 of the said

status report to contend that petitioner and co-accused Sunil Kumar Yogi, had received an amount of Rs.27 lakh through transfer in their bank accounts and apart from that, the petitioner had also received an amount of Rs.7 lakh in cash from the complainant party. However, neither the Visa had been obtained in the name of the complainant's wife nor the original documents handed over by the complainant to the petitioner, have been returned. It is, thus, submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the racket of cheating the innocent people of their hard earned money under the false promise of sending them abroad.

The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. From the facts available and the averments contained in the status report, it is apparent that the petitioner had though taken money from the complainant and his relatives, but did not send the complainant's wife abroad i.e. Canada. Thus, the petitioner is required for his custodial interrogation.

In view of the above, no case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

22.09.2021

Rajeev (rvs)

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No