

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

221

CRM-M-37248-2021

Date of decision : 11.10.2021.

Jagpreet Sodhi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Vipul Babuta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. P.P.S. Duggal, Advocate for the complainant.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 0042 dated 10.03.2021, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sadar Kotkapura, District Faridkot.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations are primarily against co-accused Surinder Kaur Sodhi, who is the wife of the petitioner and has been arrested. They are living separately and a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, is pending adjudication in a Court at Ludhiana. A copy of the petition is at Annexure P3. The allegations against the petitioner are that a sum of ₹1,00,000/- was deposited by the son of the complainant in the account held jointly by the petitioner and co-accused Surinder Kaur Sodhi. The payment of rest of the money for sending the grandchildren of the complainant abroad was deposited in the account of M/s

Sahibzada International Management Institute, which is solely owned and managed by co-accused Surinder Kaur Sodhi.

This Court, by order dated 09.09.2021 had directed the petitioner to appear before the Investigating Officer and join investigation and in the event of his arrest, he was ordered to be released on ad-interim bail to the satisfaction of the Investigating/Arresting Officer, subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Learned State counsel, upon instructions from SI Satpal Singh, states that although the petitioner has joined investigation but he is not cooperating and money is yet to be recovered. He also contends that the petitioner along with his wife was actively involved in the management of the institute which had duped the complainant. Therefore, he is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

In view of the serious allegations against the petitioner and his wife of having duped the complainant of his hard earned money, I do not deem it appropriate to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

October 11, 2021
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No