

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

**CRM-M No.17548 of 2023**  
Date of decision: 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2023

Dheeraj

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Ms. Nancy Vashistha, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Haryana  
for the respondent/State.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.182 dated 10.05.2022 under Sections 406, 420 IPC registered at Police Station Madlauda, District Panipat.

On the last date of hearing, it had been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner had no role to play in the crime in question and his role, if any, was restricted only to arranging meeting between the complainant and one Harvinder Singh, who was in fact running an immigration Company. It had also not been disputed by the learned counsel that an amount of ₹ 34.00 lacs had indeed been transferred into the account of the petitioner, however, it had been urged by her that it was for the purpose of procuring Canadian visa through co-accused Harvinder Singh.

On being put to notice, learned State counsel on instructions from SI Satpal has disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite. He submits that in fact the petitioner was the prime accused in the crime in question and ₹ 34.00 lacs, which had been transferred by him into the account of Harvinder Singh, was also found to be a fake transaction as the said Harvinder Singh had already expired. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is involved in another case of similar nature and hence, it is evident that he is a habitual offender, for which he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, coupled with the fact that the petitioner is involved in another case of similar nature, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

However, it is made clear that anything contained hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

May 3, 2023  
rps

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |