

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

CRM-M-18561-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 25.5.2022

Amrit Singh Sohal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab,
assisted by HC Bikaramjit Singh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No. 8 dated 21.1.2020 under Sections 420, 406/120-B IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act at Police Station Khanna, District Khanna.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Sukhchain Singh wherein allegations have been levelled against the accused including the petitioner to the effect that they had defrauded the complainant Sukhchain Singh, Harinder Singh and Sarabjit Singh of a huge amount of ₹26 lacs on the pretext of sending them to Canada. It is alleged that Baldev Singh is relative of Sarabjit Singh. Sarabjit Singh at the instance of Baldev Singh, asked the complainant Sukhchain Singh and Harinder Singh, if they wanted to go abroad. Baldev Singh told them about the petitioner Amrit Singh Sohal. Accordingly, Amrit

Singh Sohal, his mother Alka Rani, Kulwinder Singh and Baldev Singh met the complainant at the house of Baldev Singh and told him that it will costs ₹ 16 lacs to go to Canada and that an amount of ₹ 8 lacs would be required to be paid in advance. In March, 2019, Amrit Singh Sohal, Kulwinder Singh and Alka Rani received amount of ₹ 2 lacs each from Sukhchain Singh and Sarabjit Singh alongwith their passports in the house of Baldev Singh and also got numerous stamp papers signed from them while assuring that they would be sent abroad by August, 2019. Later, they were asked to pay more amount and they accordingly paid ₹2 lacs each again to the accused. Additionally, Harinder Singh also gave an amount of ₹5 lacs. In November, 2019, the accused obtained another amount of ₹5 lacs from Harinder Singh and ₹ 4 lacs each from Sukhchain Singh and Sarabjit Singh and called them for fingerprinting on 8.11.2019 and that for getting the same done, they would have to go personally to the embassy alongwith their passports on 8.11.2019. However, the passports of Sukhchain Singh and Sarabjit Singh were not returned to them. Later, despite having made several calls to the accused, the phone of Amrit Singh Sohal was found switched off. It is, thus, alleged that all the accused had connived and have cheated them of huge amount.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that there is no evidence worth credence to establish the allegations as levelled in the FIR. It has been submitted that the FIR has been registered with the intervention of political leaders and was registered when the petitioner was away to England. It has further been submitted that since other co-accused are

already on bail, the petitioner also deserves the same concession on grounds of parity. It has also been submitted that the dispute infact arises from an amount which had been advanced to Labh Singh (uncle of complainant Sukhchain Singh) by co-accused Baldev Singh for the purpose of entering into an agreement for sale of land which led to a monetary dispute between Labh Singh and Baldev Singh and ultimately led to lodging of the present FIR on false allegations.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and there are specific allegations levelled against him and in these circumstances, no special case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. There are specific allegations levelled against the petitioner. Infact a perusal of the FIR would show that it is the petitioner, who is the main accused, who with the help of his co-accused had deprived the complainant Sukhchain Singh, Sarabjit Singh and Harinder Singh of a huge amount of ₹26 lacs by selling them dreams of taking them to Canada but neither the said persons were taken to Canada nor their amount was returned back and thus, the entire amount collected from the complainant was usurped. In these circumstances, no special case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
7. The petition is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.
8. However, in case the petitioner surrenders before the trial Court within a period of two weeks from today and applies for grant of regular bail, the

learned trial Court shall endeavour to dispose of the same expeditiously preferably within a period of one week from filing of such application.

25.5.2022

kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

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