

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

**CRM-M No. 22232 of 2022  
Date of Decision: 23.05.2022**

Rupinder Singh

..... Petitioner

**Versus**

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR**

Present: Mr. Ravi Malhotra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Pradeep Prakash Chahar, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

Mr. Shantanu Bansal, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner, by filing the present petition cast under Section 438 Cr.P.C., seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 0273 of 25.12.2021, which was registered against him, at Police Station Ambala Sadar, District Ambala, constituting therein offences under Sections 406 & 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. The incriminatory role, as, assigned to the bail applicant – petitioner in the petition FIR, is qua on the pretext of his sending the aggrieved to a foreign country, his duping him, for a sum of Rs. 4,10,000/-.

3. Therefore, since a reasonable percentum of the above sums of money is, required to be deposited in the establishment of the learned trial Judge concerned, as a pre-condition, for this Court, proceeding to admit the present bail petitioner, to anticipatory bail, as, it may ultimately work as victim compensation, and, after, may be a verdict of conviction becoming made by the learned Magistrate concerned, qua the petition FIR.

4. In respect of the above, the learned counsel for the petitioner,

on instructions, given to him, by the latter, submits that the petitioner is

ready and willing to, within a period of six weeks, deposit a sum of Rs. 2,25,000/-, at the establishment of the learned Magistrate concerned, for its thereafter working as victim compensation, in case a verdict of conviction is made by the learned Magistrate concerned, in the petition FIR, and, or its disbursement to the concerned, being subject to the outcome of the trial, as, may becomes entered into the petition FIR.

5. Bearing in mind the above, also when no material has been placed on record by the prosecution, suggesting that in the event of the bail applicant being enlarged on pre-arrest bail, there is every likelihood of his fleeing from justice, and, or, tampering with prosecution evidence. Therefore, this Court does not deem it fit to order for the custodial interrogation of the bail petitioner.

6. In sequel, with the afore made directions, at para-4 (supra), it is ordered that in the event of arrest of the bail applicant-petitioner, he be released on anticipatory bail, by the Investigation Officer, on his furnishing personal and surety bonds in the sum of ₹ 50,000/- each, before him, and, also subject to his not tampering with prosecution evidence, and/or not influencing prosecution witnesses, and, also, as and when he is summoned by the investigating officer, through a written Hukamnama, his cooperating in the investigations to be made into the offence(s) concerned.

7. Disposed of.

**May 23, 2022**  
'dk kamra'

**( SURESHWAR THAKUR )**  
**JUDGE**

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |