

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

**CRM-M-44383-2021
Reserved on : 28.10.2021
Date of Decision: 01.11.2021**

ROSHAN BHARTI

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sandeep Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J.

This petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 0831 dated 11.10.2021, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of the IPC at Police Station City Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations in the FIR registered at the instance of complainant-Mahaveer, it is stated that co-accused of the petitioner i.e. his father namely Gagan Dev Bharti has constructed a temple at his house and is working as an Astrologer. The petitioner and the co-accused contacted him to give a sum of Rs.8,25,000/- for providing him a job in Kurukshetra University. Thereafter, the complainant gave the amount in two installments and an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- was transferred in the name of the petitioner.

Thereafter, by withdrawing the amount from the account, the same was paid to the accused, however, the accused failed to provide the job and has not returned the amount back.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that in fact the brother of the petitioner on an earlier occasion has registered FIR No.0128 dated 17.07.2021 and as a counter-blast to the same, the present FIR has been registered.

Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant submits that the complainant in FIR No.0128 dated 17.07.2021, is not the real brother of the petitioner and the petitioner has just created a ground by giving a reference to the aforesaid FIR.

On merits, it is argued that there are direct allegations against the petitioner and his father that they have taken money from the victim/complainant for providing him a job of Clerk in Kurukshetra University and some amount was transferred through bank transactions.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Without commenting upon the merits of the case and going through the serious allegations levelled against the petitioner in the FIR, I find no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

01.11.2021
Chetan Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No