

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

201-2

**CRM-M No.42810 of 2020
Date of decision:15.02.2021**

Raminder Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Mandeep Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

SUVIR SEHGAL J. (ORAL)

The Court has been convened through video conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

In the instant petition under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.202 dated 19.02.2020, Annexure P-1, registered under Section 10 of Emigration Act and Sections 406 and 420 IPC at Police Station Thanesar City, District Kurukshetra.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that there is no allegation of entrustment of money to the petitioner. According to the counsel, the sole role attributed to the petitioner is that the co-accused had taken the complainant to the petitioner and his wife, who had extended an assurance that the brother of the petitioner will be sent to Australia, failing which, the money would be returned.

Per contra, learned State counsel upon instructions from SI Devender Kumar, has opposed the petition. He has relied on the status report filed by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, City

Kurukshetra to contend that the petitioner is involved in 10 other FIRs of a similar nature and that during the course of investigation, it has been found that huge sum of money has been given to the petitioner by the co-accused.

I have considered the respective submissions of the parties.

The petitioner is a travel agent. From the perusal of the status report, it appears that the co-accused were working for him. In Para 5 of the status report, the State has given the details of the amount of Rs.24,33,000/- paid over the period of time to the petitioner by co-accused, Ravinder Singh, and Rs.24,80,000/- received by the petitioner from the other co-accused.

Still further, petitioner is involved in 10 other cases of a similar nature, wherein he is alleged to have duped different persons on the pretext of sending them abroad. Status report also shows that the petitioner is on the run and raids have been conducted by the police at different points of time over the last six months, but the petitioner managed to evade arrest. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessary to unearth the nexus between the petitioner and the co-accused.

No ground is made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Petition is accordingly dismissed.

It is clarified that any observation made hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression on the merits of the case.

15.02.2021
sheetal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No