

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

217

**CRM-M-25700-2022
Date of decision : 15.11.2023**

Jyoti Thakur

..... Petitioner

versus

State of U.T., Chandigarh

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Ms. Manjot Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP, U.T. Chandigarh and
Mr. Amit Kumar Goyal, APP, U.T. Chandigarh
assisted by Mr. Shiv Charan, Inspector.

Mr. Shivender Pal, Advocate for
Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate
for the complainant.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.199 dated 24.05.2018, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Sector 36, U.T. Chandigarh.
2. As per the contents of the FIR, it has been alleged as under:-

“To SSP Sahib UT Chandigarh Subject H.C.F.S Immigration SCF 146-147 43B Chandigarh On behalf of Chandigarh Fraud related application in the name of sending abroad I requests that we are from Punjab Belongs to different districts. Newspapers and T.V. We prepared our file in the name of sending HCFS Company to Quebec State (Canada) and collected about 4-5 lakhs from each student and in which

2023:PHHC:148611

240,000/- each student in the name of CAQ (Quebec Acceptance Certificate) which is less than the actual fee of 6,000/-. Apart from this 20,000/- in the name of registration and 14,000/- for the offer letter and Security Fee 1050 CAD (which makes 56,000/- of the college) was taken. According to the agreement, the time has passed and they are not returning our money nor have returned many documents. When we go to their office, they make threats. They have kept their bouncers, which kill them. Due to non-availability of certificates of many students, different students have also stopped and time is being wasted. By doing kindly and appropriate action should be taken.”

3. Petitioner is stated to be one of the Directors of the Company, who is facing more than 300 complaints, precisely 337 for having duped innocent peoples on the pretext of sending them abroad. Not only this, even the conduct of the petitioner is a big impediment in granting her indulgence. The petitioner was granted regular bail vide order dated 26.06.2018 (Annexure P-3). However, was declared as ‘proclaimed offender’ having absented herself from process of law on 29.02.2020 and later on surrendered about one year on 05.02.2021.
4. Keeping in view the allegations levelled against the petitioner and her conduct, this Court does not finds it to be a case for grant of bail.
5. Resultantly, the present petition is dismissed.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

15.11.2023
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No