

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

**CRM-M No.49592 of 2021
Date of Decision: 04.02.2022**

Rajesh Kumar

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent.

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: *HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA*

Present:- Mr. Sant Lal Barwala, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

Apprehending his arrest in the criminal case pertaining to the FIR bearing No.0573 dated 19.09.2021 registered at Police Station Narnaund, Hansi, District Hisar, under Sections 406, 420 and 506 read with Section 34 IPC, the petitioner has preferred this petition for seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

Bereft of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled by complainant Sunil Kumar in the subject FIR, are that the petitioner, along-with his co-accused, duped him (complainant) of an amount of Rs.10 lacs on the pretext of getting him employed in some Government Department

and when a Panchayat was convened in this regard, the petitioner gave him two cheques worth Rs.4.5 lacs and Rs.4.0 lacs and later-on, the same were found to be relating to the bank account which had already been closed by him (petitioner) and when he (complainant) asked for the refund of the said amount, he was threatened with dire consequences.

Status-report has already been filed on behalf of the respondent-State by way of the affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Narnaund.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel in the instant petition and have also perused the file thoroughly.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been got falsely implicated in this case as he had never received any amount from the complainant for arranging for a Government job for him and rather, the above-said two cheques had been handed over to the relative of the complainant, who was employed in the bank, for the purposes of his (petitioner's) loan account and in these circumstances, the petitioner deserves the relief as prayed for in this petition.

However, learned State counsel argues that the petitioner, along-with his co-accused, had cheated the complainant by inducing him to pay the above-said amount to them, on the pretext of getting a Government job arranged for him and the said cheques, as issued by him to the complainant, were also found to be relating to a bank account closed by him long ago and keeping in view the gravity of the offence committed by

him, this petition be dismissed.

The complainant has specifically alleged in the FIR that the petitioner and his co-accused had obtained a sum of Rs.10 lacs from him by alluring him qua his employment with some Government Department but neither they refunded the said amount nor got him so employed and rather, the petitioner issued the said cheques worth the afore-said amounts to him which pertained to the bank account already closed by him. Though the petitioner claims that the said cheques had been given for the purposes of his loan account as some relative of the complainant was employed in that Bank but however, the fact remains that at this stage, the petitioner has not placed any material on the file to substantiate this fact.

Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances, as well as the gravity of the offence as alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that he (petitioner) does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed.

February 04, 2022
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*