



IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-17987-2024
DECIDED ON: 19.04.2024

SUDEEP SEHRAWAT @ SONU

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. V.C. Shukla, Advocate (through VC) and
Mr. Govind Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C. has been invoked seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 223, dated 22.09.2023, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B, 419, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Panjokhra, Ambala.
2. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been further contended that the amount whatsoever has been transferred in the accounts of the co-accused of the petitioner namely Parineeti Chaudhary and her relatives. Not even a single penny has been tranferred in the account of the petitioner from complainant's account, which is sufficient to infer that he is not involved in commissioning of offence of cheating with the complainant. The petitioner has been made a scape goat in the



present case, as there is no direct evidence against him, to connect him with the present case.

3. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. According to the said certificate the petitioner has suffered incarceration for a period of 4 months and 18 days, as of now. He is also involved in another case under IPC but in that case he is on bail, as is evident from the custody certificate. He has opposed the prayer made in the present petition stating that the petitioner has cheated the complainant for a huge amount and antecedents of the petitioner are also not good.

4. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties.

5. On perusal of FIR, *prima-facie*, there are grounds to believe that the petitioner and his co-accused namely Parineeti Chaudhary had cheated the complainant for the huge amount. Moreover, it is also evident that an amount of Rs.40,000/- was deposited in the account of the petitioner by co-accused Parineeti Chaudhary, which is sufficient for this Court to infer that the petitioner has actively participated in commissioning of offence of cheating. Such kind of offences are increasing day to day, which require to be dealt with strictly. There is every possibility that in case the petitioner is allowed the concession of bail at this stage, he may abscond or again fall into wrong hands. Since, *prima-facie*, no justifiable ground to extend concession of bail is made out, hence, the prayer made in the present petition is declined.

6. In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the present petition is dismissed being devoid of any merits.



7. However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

19.04.2024
sham

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

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