



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208/2

CRM-M-972-2024
Date of decision: May 21st, 2024

Jasvir Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Vinod K. Kanwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

Mr. G.C. Shahpuri, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.685 dated 02.09.2023 under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 10, 24 of The Emigration Act, 1983, added later on), registered at Police Station City Yamuna Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 06.02.2024, petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has informed the Court that the petitioner is a man of criminal antecedents; it has also been submitted, on instructions, that the petitioner had indeed extended threats to the complainant, in which regard, there was an audio recording collected by the investigating agency. Learned State counsel

has on further instructions informed the Court that the petitioner has not been cooperating with the investigating agency.

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

5. Allegedly, the petitioner and co-accused defrauded the complainant by falsely promising work VISAs for Poland and instead provided fake VISAs, for which they obtained approximately ₹50 lakh through fraudulent means. The petitioner has criminal antecedents with two other similar cases registered and pending against him. He was previously granted interim bail on 06.02.2024 but failed to cooperate with the investigating agency, as submitted by learned State counsel. Furthermore, there is an audio recording which has been taken into possession of the investigating agency after the registration of the present case where the petitioner is heard extending threats to the complainant.

5. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, the petitioner does not deserve the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail.

6. The instant petition stands dismissed.

7. 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.

May 21st, 2024

Puneet

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No