

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

103

CRM-M-53007-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.12.2022

DEEPINDER SINGH SANDHU @ HARRY SANDHU

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Arshpreet Khadial, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. KB Rehaja, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this second petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.160 dated 28.07.2022, registered under Sections 420, 406, 506 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Kotwali Patiala, District Patiala.

At the outset, it has fairly been conceded by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the earlier bail petition preferred by the petitioner was not argued and was dismissed as withdrawn on 28.10.2022.

This factor has not been disputed by the learned State counsel and the learned counsel for the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has falsely been involved in the present case; that the petitioner

is not related to accused Balwinder Kaur; that date and time of the alleged occurrence has also not been mentioned in the FIR and that the petitioner has not induced the complainant, at any stage. He further submits that there is a delay of 72 days in lodging the FIR; that co-accused, namely, Udaypal Shergill and Balwinder Kaur, are residing abroad; that the petitioner has been made as a scapegoat and that the complainant, being a Government employee, cannot transfer Rs.2,00,000/- or more. Thus, the allegations raised by the complainant are not believable. Still further, it is argued that the alleged inducement, if any, was done by co-accused, namely, Udaypal Shergill and Balwinder Kaur, as they both are residing abroad.

On the other hand, while opposing the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, learned counsel for the complainant has argued that it was the petitioner and his wife, who have taken Rs.8,25,000/- along with copies of the Aadhar Card and PAN Card from the complainant and that again on 12.05.2022, the petitioner took Rs.26,00,000/- along with three trolley bags and a laptop from the complainant, for the purpose of immigration. He further submits that the petitioner along with the co-accused have looted the complainant to the tune of Rs.34,25,000/-, on the pretext of sending him and his family members abroad and thus, he is not entitled for the concession of bail. Still further, it is argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender, inasmuch as, one more FIR No.140 dated 19.08.2019, under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station City Kotkapura, is registered and

pending against him.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The complainant, who is also a private practitioner and running a clinic, has been duped by the petitioner of his hard earned money and he in his complaint, has raised specific and serious allegations against the petitioner. As per the version of the complainant, the petitioner along with his wife has taken Rs.34,25,000/- along with other documents, on the pretext of sending the complainant and his family members abroad. Thus, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

14.12.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>