



CRM-M-31080-2024

-1-

211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31080-2024

Date of Decision:- 18.09.2024

Manjit Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and Another

...Respondents

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Dinesh Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Naveen Batra, Advocate and
Mr. Rahul Garg, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

Petitioner – Manjit Singh has filed instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 57 dated 25.05.2024 under Section 406, 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Haryana, District Hoshiarpur.

2. As per the facts of case, Raj Kumar filed written complaint alleging that he came to know that there was invitation open for going to Portugal. His known person recommended Manjit Singh and he (complainant) met him in his office. Manjit Singh told him that his work will be done with a cost of ₹11 lakhs. He (complainant) submitted his Passport and deposited sum of ₹ 1 lakh on 25.05.2021 in Axis Bank account, in the name of his wife Anita Devi. Thereafter, he paid money from time to time. He insisted Manjit Singh to return his Passport.



CRM-M-31080-2024

-2-

Thereafter, he sent him a ticket. When he packed his luggage, Manjit Singh told him that his ticket was cancelled. He did so on three occasions and thereafter, he started saying that his work has been cancelled. Since, 2021, he requested Manjit Singh and his wife Anita Devi to return his money which was to the tune of ₹6,80,000/- but in return Manjit Singh started threatening him. Ultimately, present FIR has been registered.

3. During the pendency of this bail petition, matter was referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre and petitioner's arrest was stayed to explore the possibility of compromise but the matter could not be settled.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner raised the issue that allegations levelled against him are false. He had introduced complainant with one Balwinder Singh. Only ₹2,20,000/- was transferred in his account and he is ready to make payment of same. It is wrongly alleged that complainant transferred ₹6,80,000/- to petitioner. Allegations levelled against present petitioner are false.

5. Status report is filed by learned counsel representing State. As per status report, inquiry was conducted by DSP (H.Q.), Hoshiarpur. Petitioner had agreed to send complainant abroad in a sum of ₹6,80,000/-, out of which ₹39,000/- were returned to complainant. Out of total amount, ₹3,20,000/- was received by petitioner online and regarding rest of the amount, complainant could not produce any document. In-fact petitioner has committed fraud with complainant on the pretext of sending him to foreign country.

6. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Unfortunately, matter could not be settled between the parties.



CRM-M-31080-2024

-3-

Petitioner is specifically named in FIR. Huge amount is involved. Thus, he is required to join the investigation. Considering the specific allegations, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner – Manjit Singh and accordingly, petition filed by him is dismissed.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

18.09.2024
lalit

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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