

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

**CRM-M-30079-2023
Date of decision : 06.07.2023**

Jai Singh **...Petitioner**
Vs.

State of Haryana and others **...Respondents**

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Nand Lal Sammi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 (2) Cr.P.C for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.4 vide order dated 02.01.2023 (Annexure P-2) in case FIR No.378 dated 21.10.2022 registered under Sections 406 and 420 Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Mullana, District Ambala, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that complainant was induced by the accused persons to pay a sum of Rs.3,50,000/- for sending her sons abroad, but despite the payment, the accused persons failed to send the complainant's children abroad. He submits that the allegations in the FIR are serious, but the learned Sessions Judge, Ambala vide order dated 02.01.2023 has wrongly granted the concession of anticipatory bail to respondent No.4- Gourav. He submits that for effective investigation the custodial interrogation of respondent No.4 is essential and prays that the concession of anticipatory bail extended to respondent No.4 be cancelled.

Upon hearing the learned counsel and considering his

submissions, this Court does not find any merit in the argument advanced by the learned counsel as the Sessions Judge, Ambala has extended the concession after considering the stand of the Investigating officer. According to the Investigating Officer, the accused had joined the investigation pursuant to the interim concession of pre-arrest bail. Apart from it, considering the nature of the offence and the allegations in the FIR, this Court finds that it is not a case where the Court of Sessions has exceeded its jurisdiction.

Further, during the course of hearing, Mr. Sammi, learned counsel for the complainant is unable to refer any material to show that the accused had either mislead the Court or ever misused the concession of bail. Thus, no ground is made out for exercise of jurisdiction under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C.

Petition is dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

06.07.2023
neeraj

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No