

215-A

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

CRM-M-46685-2022
Date of decision : 31.10.2022

Rajdeep Singh @ Rajdeep Singh Bajaj ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Raman Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Rajeev K. Kapila, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.53 dated 10.04.2021 registered under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014 (Section 120-B of IPC has been added later on) at Police Station Division No.6, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

On 12.10.2022, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Inter alia contends that even during the course of enquiry in the present case, it is co-accused Chetan Kumar Prasher as well as Sheetal Tandon, who had admitted that they had received Rs.14,76,000/- from the complainant and bank transaction of the complainant showed the transfer of only Rs.10,000/- and Rs.15,000/-. It is further submitted that during the investigation, no role of the petitioner in the

alleged crime could be found. It is stated that no amount has been transferred in the account of the petitioner, nor there is any specific allegation levelled with respect to any specific entrustment of money against the present petitioner. It is further stated that in order to show his bonafide and without admitting his liability, the petitioner is ready to pay an amount of Rs.50,000/- to the complainant. It is also stated that the anticipatory bail application of the co-accused Sheetal Tandon is listed for 31.10.2022.

Notice of motion for 31.10.2022.

To be heard along with CRM-M-37864-2022.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner is ordered to be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting / Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is directed to prepare a demand draft of an amount of Rs.50,000/- in the name of the complainant and hand over the same to the Investigating Officer within a period of 10 days from today and the Investigating Officer is directed to hand over the same to the complainant after taking receipt from the complainant.

It is made clear that in case the demand draft of the said amount is not handed over to the Investigating Officer within a period 10 days from today, then the interim order granted is liable to be vacated. The payment of Rs.50,000/- to the complainant would be not construed as an admission of guilt by the petitioner.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in pursuance of the abovesaid order dated 12.10.2022, the petitioner has joined

the investigation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has already given demand draft amounting to Rs.50,000/- prepared in the name of complainant to the Investigating Officer and the Investigating Officer has handed over the same to the complainant.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Jagdish Lal, has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further custodial interrogation. It is further submitted that complainant has received the demand draft amounting to Rs.50,000/-. It is contended that as far as the present petitioner is concerned, an amount of Rs.5 lacs was paid by cash regarding which the complainant also has photographs.

Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances moreso, the facts which have been noticed in order dated 12.10.2022 and also the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for further custodial interrogation and the fact that the petitioner has complied with order dated 12.10.2022, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 12.10.2022 is ordered to be made absolute.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

31.10.2022

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No