



103 (2)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20453-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 08.05.2024

Ranjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Sumit S. Bairagi, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Kiran Pal Singh, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Abhinav Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present first petition has been filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 29 dated 10.02.2024, under Sections 406, 420 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and Section 24 of The Emigration Act, 1983, registered at Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat.

(2) Above FIR was registered on the basis of statement made by complainant-Anand Singh with the allegations that petitioner alongwith co-accused duped complainant to the tune of Rs.73,50,000/- on the pretext of sending his son to USA.

(3) Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he has been falsely implicated in the present case as there are some friendly monetary transactions with the complainant as certain amount was deposited by the complainant in the account of petitioner. Further contends that petitioner was only a mediator and guarantor between complainant as well as the persons, who were sending his son abroad.



- (4) Per contra, learned State counsel on instructions from the quarter concerned contended that petitioner and his co-accused duped complainant to the tune of Rs.73,50,000/- on the pretext of sending his son to USA. Further contended that recovery of alleged amount as well as other documents are yet to be effected.
- (5) Learned counsel for the complainant contended that he had sold his agriculture land in order to pay Rs.73,50,000/- to the petitioner as well as co-accused, but they failed to honour the commitment and misappropriated the amount.
- (6) Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper book.
- (7) Allegations are that petitioner alongwith co-accused defrauded complainant and duped him to the tune of Rs.73,50,000/- on the pretext of sending his son to USA. Also transpires that in order to discharge the liability, petitioner- Ranjeet Singh issued two cheques for an amount of Rs. 60 lakhs and Rs. 10 lakhs, respectively; but both the cheques were dishonoured. The recovery of alleged amount alongwith PAN Card, Aadhar Card and Family ID of the complainant are yet to be effected. Therefore, in such a scenario, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is the only way out.
- (8) In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.
- (9) Consequently, petition is dismissed.
- (10) The observations made above be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case; rather confined only to decide the present petition.
- (11) Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

08.05.2024
Harish Kumar/v

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No