



CRM-M-31748-2024

1

209/2
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31748-2024
Date of Decision : 05.08.2024

Vikas

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG Haryana

Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate
for the complainant

KIRTI SINGH, J.(Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No.0273 dated 09.05.2024, under Sections 120-B, 406, 420 IPC registered at Police Station Old Industrial Panipat, District Panipat.

2. In compliance to the previous order, status report by way of an affidavit of Sh. Sandeep Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, HQ, Panipat on behalf of respondent-State was filed.

3. As per the status report, the petitioner has been specifically named as an accused in the FIR and he in conspiracy with co-accused Kavita and Sanjay duped a sum of Rs. 15,03,200/- from the complainant under the pretext of engaging his son as a Sub-Inspector in Delhi Police. Furthermore, it has been discovered that accused Vikas received a significant portion of this amount,

**CRM-M-31748-2024****2**

totaling Rs. 3,80,000/-. It has also been stated that accused Vikas was using the bank account of his wife although the mobile number in the account was of Vikas himself. The petitioner is habitual of such types of frauds and is found to be involved in two other cases/FIRs of similar nature as per police record verified by Investigating Officer. The details are as under-

(i) FIR No. 201 dated 09.05.2024 u/s 406 and 420 of IPC, registered an P.S. Civil Lines, District Kaithal. The petitioner is absconding in this case.

(ii) FIR No. 154 dated 05.04.2022 u/s 384, 406, 420, 506 and 34 of IPC, registered at P.S. Model Town, District Panipat. The petitioner is on bail in this case and the case is under trial.

4. In view of the above, without adverting anything on the merits of the case this Court is of the considered opinion that in order to unearth the true dimensions of the alleged crime, the police requires custodial interrogation of the petitioner in this case. Hence, the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail and, accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

05.08.2024

reena

**(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No
Whether reportable? Yes/No