

**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT
AT CHANDIGARH**

.... Respondent

matter of record that his own mother was a government employee and would have been aware that government jobs could not be procured by giving any money. It has also been submitted that nothing is required to be recovered from the petitioner and hence, his custodial interrogation would also not be necessitated in the present case.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

4. A perusal of the allegations levelled in the FIR, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1, reveals that it was the petitioner at whose behest the complainant was duped into parting with huge amount of money on the pretext of procuring a government job (Railways) for him; the involvement of the petitioner in another case of identical nature indicates that it is not only the complainant of the instant case, who had been duped by the petitioner but the petitioner had been playing similar fraud upon many innocent persons.

5. In the circumstances and keeping in view the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner and his criminal antecedents, the petitioner does not deserve the extra-ordinary concession of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

12.03.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No