

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-50065-2023

Date of Decision: 10.10.2023.

Harpreet Singh Nagra @ Happy

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

. . . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Karandeep Singh Sindhu, Advocate, for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 438 Cr.PC is to grant anticipatory bail in case FIR No.283 dated 25.07.2023 registered at Police Station Civil Line, Kaithal, District Kaithal, under Sections 420/406 IPC.

2. Complaint was made by one Sunil Kumar to Superintendent of Police, Kaithal alleging that Harpreet Singh (present petitioner) had opened a firm by name of M/s Abroad Education Service and on the pretext of sending Mukul son of the petitioner to Canada, received an amount of ₹6,23,703/- from him. However, petitioner neither sent the son of the complainant to Canada nor returned the amount except returning an amount of ₹1.50 lakh.

3. It is contended by ld. counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated; that no money was transferred in his account and rather, the amount was transferred in the account of the firm; that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and so, he be allowed anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State.

6. Ld. State counsel has pointed out that it was found during investigation that petitioner had entered into a settlement with the complainant, wherein he had admitted to have received the amount. It was also noticed by ld. Additional Sessions Judge, while rejecting the bail petition that even the Look Out Circular regarding the petitioner has been got issued by the Investigating Agency.

7. After hearing both the sides, and having perused the paper-book, this Court finds present case to be unfit for grant of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

10.10.2023
Vivek

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable?	Yes/No