

236 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2593-2024
Decided on : 23.01.2024

Satinder Kumar Petitioner

Versus

State of UT, Chandigarh Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Ms. Ekta Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP, UT Chandigarh
with Mr. Amit Goyal, APP, UT, Chandigarh.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No.15 dated 03.02.2022 under Section 420 IPC registered at Police Station Sector 3 (North), Chandigarh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case; he was not even known to the complainant much less his cousin, hence, there was no occasion for the complainant to give a huge amount of money to the petitioner as has been alleged in the FIR in question, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the

petitioner has now been in custody for almost four months having been arrested on 07.09.2023 and there is still no likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future as only challan has been presented till now. It has been asserted that in a Magisterial trial the petitioner cannot be made to languish in custody as investigation is complete.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. It has been submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and this is not the first time that he has been involved in a case of cheating; the petitioner is involved in three other cases of similar nature, and there is every likelihood that in case the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he could engage in similar fraudulent activities yet again.

It has been further asserted that the petitioner duped the complainant and his cousin of an amount of Rs.25 lakhs, by falsely promising him help to get royalty worth crores of rupees waived off due to his connections, which had been imposed on construction company of the complainant's cousin, by the PWD Department. Though the petitioner partially refunded Rs.10 lakhs, but that was his *modus operandi* in the other cases also. Learned State counsel on instructions has informed the Court that charges have not yet been framed and are likely to be framed on the next date of hearing.

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

5. In the light of serious allegations levelled against the petitioner coupled with his criminal antecedents, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

6. 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.

23.01.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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