

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

CRM-M-47047-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 14.10.2022

Venus Garg

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. P.C. Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 157 dated 18.05.2022, registered under Sections 406, 420, 506, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Chhappar, District Yamuna Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR; that there is no allegation of demand of any money against the petitioner; that the petitioner has falsely been indicted in the present case, on the disclosure statement of co-accused Renu Kadiyan and that as far as other four cases against the petitioner are concerned, they are all of similar nature and in that cases, he is on bail.

In support of his case, learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sushil Aggarwal and others Vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another, 2020 (1) RCR (Criminal) 833.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of this Court, learned State counsel accepts notice and submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender; that in case bearing FIR No. 182 dated 26.06.2021, registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Yamunanagar, granted anticipatory to the petitioner vide order dated 08.06.2022, as co-accused Renu Kadiyan and Virender Kumar, who were specifically named and have been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court; that in the present case, the petitioner has been specifically named as Gupta Ji by the complainant and victims, who belongs to the weaker-section of the society; that the petitioner and co-accused cheated the complainant and victims to the tune of Rs. 7,50,000/- on the pretext of availing benefits of widow pension, jobs, ration cards etc. and that moreover the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in four other cases of similar nature and if the bail is granted to him, he will involve himself in other cases.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the documents on record.

The petitioner was specifically named in the FIR, though he was named as Gupta Ji as the complainant and victims does not know his actual name and moreover, co-accused Renu Kadiyan has specifically named the petitioner in her disclosure statement. The petitioner and co-accused persons cheated the complainant and victims to the tune of Rs. 7,50,000/- by inducing them to help them in getting benefits of various Government Schemes and jobs.

Considering the nature of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the gang(s) of persons involved in such type of activities in the area. 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

14.10.2022
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No