

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

105

CRM-M-64806-2023

Date of decision: 22.12.2023

Peter Sahota alias Samith Sahota

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.132 dated 13.08.2023 under Sections 384, 406, 420, 506, 120-B of the IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Siwan, District Kaithal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that false allegations have been levelled against him of having induced the complainant to part with an amount of ₹42 lakhs on the pretext of sending him to the U.S.A. Learned counsel submits that no doubt some amount was received in his bank account from the complainant, however, it was in lieu of the commission, which he had charged from the petitioner in his capacity as sub-agent of the travel agency.

3. On a pointed query put to the learned counsel as to whether the petitioner has any criminal antecedents, he submits that the petitioner stands acquitted in two cases, however, there are two more cases pending against him.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. At this stage, Mr. M.R. Sharma, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his memorandum of appearance which is taken on record. He undertakes to file his power of attorney in the Registry of this Court.

7. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Raj Kumar, has informed the Court that there has been material concealment in the instant petition. In so far as the criminal antecedents of the petitioner is concerned, learned State counsel on instructions, has informed the Court that the petitioner is involved in as many as 32 other criminal cases of similar nature as is evident from the order dated 21.09.2023 passed by the learned Trial Court whereby application for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner was dismissed.

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

9. Prima facie, the petitioner appears to be a habitual offender as he is involved in 32 other criminal cases of similar nature. In the circumstances, this Court is not inclined to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

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

22.12.2023

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No