

202

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.33240 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.09.2021

Rohit Kumar @ Rana

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.P.S. Rehan, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.188 dated 25.09.2020 registered under Section 420 IPC and 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014, at Police Station City Gurdaspur, District Gurdaspur.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of Meena Kumari, her son Rohit Kumar wanted to go abroad and in that process, he contacted the petitioner – Rohit Kumar @ Rana, who demanded Rs.6.50 lacs for sending the son of the complainant to Greece and an amount of Rs.5.00 lacs was paid to him on different dates. It is further stated that the son of the complainant was sent to Romania instead of Greece and thereafter, he was sent to Uzbekistan from where he was deported back and sent back to India and in that process, the petitioner has cheated the complainant. It is further submitted that on 16.10.2020, considering the fact that petitioner had made a representation before this Court that he is ready to return the amount and settle the dispute, he was released on bail. It was further stated on that day, that the petitioner ill hand over a demand draft of Rs.2.5 lacs to the Investigating Officer favouring the

complainant. Thereafter, the case was adjourned on number of dates as the petitioner represented that he may be granted more time to comply with the order dated 16.10.2020.

On 23.03.2021, it was made clear that if the amount is not paid by the petitioner, the interim protection shall stand vacated and, therefore, the case is heard on merits.

Counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that there are vague allegations in the complaint for sending the son of the complainant abroad.

Counsel for the State, assisted by counsel for the complainant and on instructions from the Investigating Officer, has submitted that the complainant has submitted the proof of handing over the money to the petitioner, who instead of arranging a VISA for Greece has sent the son of the complainant to Uzbekistan, from where he was deported back to India and in that process, the complainant was cheated.

After hearing the counsel for the parties, considering the serious allegations against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

16.09.2021
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No