



CRM-M-30382-2024 (O&amp;M)

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

Sr. No.212**CRM-M-30382-2024(O&M)****Date of decision : 04.07.2024**

Jaspreet Singh Kohli @ Sam Kohli

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH**

Present: Mr. Palvinder Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate, for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)**

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0033 dated 23.03.2024 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Mansa Devi Complex, District Panchkula.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the present case has been registered on the basis of the complaint moved by the complainant i.e. Ashish Singh Walia, resident of Sector 4 MDC, Panchkula. It has been averred in the complaint that the complainant is running a glass factory in Panchkula and he came in contact with the accused persons namely Inder Pal Kohli, Bhawna Kohli and Jaspreet Singh Kohli @ Sam Kohli (the present petitioner) through his friend namely Satinder Yadav. Further, it is alleged that the accused Inder Pal Kohli and Bhawna Kohli had claimed that they had good connection Government Departments and they may help him in producing Government contracts for supplying glasses. In the meanwhile, accused Inder Pal Kohli

telephonically informed the complainant that the tender will be notified in



the month of August, 2023 for fixing glasses in Police Line, Panchkula and they will give this tender awarded to him. Therefore, the accused namely Inder Pal Kohli and his wife Bhawna Kohli told the complainant that the tender amount would be approximately Rs. 5 crores and they demanded 10% of the tender amount on the pretext that same shall be given to officials who are involved in the tender. The complainant by way of making payment in the bank accounts of the company owned by accused Inder Pal Kohli and by making payment in cash as well paid a sum of Rs.43,50,000/- which was received by the accused persons. However, later on the complainant came to know that the tender papers provided to him were forged documents and no tender had been issued by the Police Department, Haryana. It has been further alleged that when the complainant had asked to return his money back, he was threatened for dire consequences.

Counsel for the petitioner further submits that there is a considerable delay in lodging the FIR, the date of occurrence was 01.08.2023 whereas the FIR was lodged on 23.03.2024 and the petitioner had filed a complaint dated 30.11.2023 to the Police Authorities against the complainant. He further submits that he had never interacted with the complainant personally and only vague allegation(s) has been made against him.

Vide order dated 24.06.2024, the learned State counsel had been directed to file status report, in compliance to which, learned State counsel has filed status report dated 04.07.2024 in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per status report, it is mentioned that during the investigation it was found that on 17.08.2023 the location of the present petitioner and the co-accused namely Inderpal Kohli was found to be at the



house of the complainant situated at MDC Panchkula where they had allegedly given the fake receipts, licence and tender documents to the complainant. Thereafter, the complainant had given an amount of Rs.20 lacs to accused persons namely Inderpal Kohli and the present petitioner in the presence of one Vikram Sharma. He also submits that the present petitioner had approached the learned trial Court for grant of anticipatory bail and the same has been dismissed twice vide order dated 29.05.2024 and 14.06.2024.

Heard.

After hearing the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the status report filed by the State, this Court is of the opinion that petitioner is not entitled to the discretionary power granted under Section 438 Cr.P.C.

In view of above, the present petition is dismissed.

(KIRTI SINGH)  
JUDGE

04.07.2024

Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No