

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-45062-2023

Date of Decision: 31.10.2023

Tarun Chugh

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Arpandeeep Narula, Advocate, for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

By way of this petition filed under Section 438 CrPC, petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0604 dated 26.07.2023 registered at Police Station Civil Line Sirsa, District Sirsa, under Sections 406/420/506 IPC.

2. FIR was lodged on the complaint of one Sapna Rani, as per which she came in contact with accused Tarun Chugh (petitioner), who allured him to arrange a job for her and her brother by stating that he was posted as a clerk in office of Protection Office, Women Police Station Sirsa. He demanded ₹2.5 lakh for the said work. An amount of ₹70,000/- was paid on 29.05.2023. It is alleged that brother of the complainant was brought to Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa [CDLU] for interview and then taken to examination centre, where he was introduced with some persons. He was assured that his interview was complete and appointment letter shall come to his house. As per the demand of the petitioner, another amount of ₹1,80,000/- was paid.

However, later on the complainant came to know that petitioner had

already been terminated from the job. She demanded her money back from the petitioner, but he refused to do so, rather threatened her with dire consequences.

3. It is contended by ld. counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated; that in fact petitioner had borrowed an amount of ₹70,000/- from complainant for some immediate need and on account of failure to pay the same, a false story has been concocted. Ld. counsel further contends that petitioner is ready to join investigation.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Randhir Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1/State. Mr. Rajinder Singh, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent No.2/complainant and filed his power of attorney.

6. Ld. State counsel has drawn attention towards para-No.6 of the order dated 01.08.2023 passed by ld. Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa, whereby anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner was rejected, in which it was observed that complainant had played a recording in her mobile in the Court, which endorsed her allegations made in the FIR, though said voice recording was to be collected by the police during investigation.

7. Having regard to the nature of allegations against the petitioner and the fact that he himself admits to have received at least an amount of ₹70,000/-, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be required to probe the entire truth. This Court does not find the present case to be fit for grant of anticipatory bail. At the same time, this Court also observes that by admitting to have paid an amount of ₹2.50 lakh to

the petitioner for arranging a job, complainant herself has committed an illegal act.

Dismissed.

31.10.2023

Vivek

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

- 1. Whether speaking/reasoned?
- 2. Whether reportable?

Yes
Yes/No