

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

**CRM-M-24874-2022 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 01.06.2022**

Lovely Mehta @ Sunny Mehta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Munish Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

M. Abhinav Gupta, APP UT Chandigarh.

\*\*\*\*

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

Through the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 79 dated 13.05.2022 registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC, at Police Station South, Sector-34, Chandigarh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the FIR was registered on the complaint of Ajay Mittal and Harish Kumar; that as per the allegations, the petitioner and his friend, had taken four vehicles from the complainant party on rent on self-driving basis but after removing the GPS system from the vehicles, they misused the same; that the actual story is that the petitioner is a driver by profession and had taken only one Breeza car on rent from the complainant party on contractual basis on 10.12.2021 @ Rs. 45,000/- p.m. and had paid entire rent through google pay, thereafter, the complainant party

taken the Breeza car back after settling the amount and the present FIR has been lodged just to grab money from the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned APP UT Chandigarh opposes the prayer and submits that there are specific allegations against the petitioner and the vehicles are yet to be recovered.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and APP UT Chandigarh and have also gone through the paper-book.

There are specific allegations against the petitioner and his friend that they have taken the cars on rent from the complainant party, which are to facilitate the general public, and misused the vehicles by removing the GPS systems from the cars.

Considering the nature of the allegations contained in the FIR and for the recovery of the vehicles, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

In view of the above, the present petition is dismissed.

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

**01.06.2022**  
*Mangal Singh*

Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No