

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

CRM-M-22645-2021

Date of decision: 30.05.2022

Gurmeet Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Petition qua petitioner No.1 stands dismissed as having become infructuous, vide order dated 13.09.2021.

Mr. Siddharth Tanwar, Advocate,
for petitioner No.2.

Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, petitioner No.2 seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.184 dated 22.12.2019, registered at Police Station Bullowal, District Hoshiarpur, under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC and Section 13 of the Punjab Prevention of Human Smuggling Act, 2012.

Learned counsel for petitioner No.2 contends that petitioner No.2 has falsely been implicated in the present case; that he had never received any amount from the complainant for sending him abroad; that there is no specific allegation of cheating against him, and that co-accused, namely, Hardeep Singh and Manjot Singh have since been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 12.11.2021 passed in CRM-M-22637-2021.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that as per the status report, petitioner No.2 in connivance with the co-accused had cheated the complainant for a huge amount on the pretext of sending him abroad. Even petitioner No.2 met the complainant by impersonating himself as Sonu Khera.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

There are specific allegations against petitioner No.2 that he had received Rs.4 lakh alongwith blank cheques as well as registered sale deed of the house, from the complainant on the pretext of sending him abroad. Furthermore, petitioner No.2 also impersonated himself as Sonu Khera, a travel agent and remained a member of conspiracy to cheat the complainant.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court finds that petitioner No.2 is required for custodial interrogation.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed qua petitioner No.2.

30.05.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No