

215

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-39888-2024
Date of Decision:-16.10.2024

ROBIN KUMAR

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Anmol Jindal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, DAG, Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

By way of the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) the petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in FIR detailed as under (Annexure P-1) :-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
132	16.04.2024	420, 406, IPC	Civil Lines District, Jind.

2. Argument heard.
3. It is, *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case and the petitioner has no concern with the allegations levelled in theFIR. He



submits that the petitioner had taken the amount from complainant for his journey to Combodia and had never assured of providing him any work Visa, hence prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra* learned State counsel referring to the reply submitted by the State has assailed these arguments by submitting that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having taken around ₹2 lakh from the complainant for providing work Visa to the complainant but they were duped and not provided the work Visa, although provided ticket to go to Thailand. He submits that keeping in view the serious allegations against the petitioner, his custodial interrogation is required. Hence he prays for dismissal of the petition.

5. After considering the arguments and perusing the record, it is observed that the instant case was registered against the petitioner and one Sunil Malik by the complainant Rekha alleging that they were working as travel agent, sending people abroad. They assured her husband that he will be sent to cambodia on work visa and ₹2 lakh for the same with the assurance that they will get fixed salary of 800-1000 dollars per month. Further, instead of sending them to Cambodia the petitioner had sent her husband to Thailand and thereafter taken to Cambodia through the Chinese Company engaged in human trafficking. After staying at Cambodia for two days the husband of complainant and his friend were taken to one hotel on the pretext of interview where one agent snatched the gold ornaments. Thereafter, on 17.10.2024 he returned back to India and asked the petitioner and Sunil to return the amount as they had not provided the work Visa,



which they refused. The State while filing the reply has also annexed the bank account statement and also the messages transmitted between the petitioner and the complainant to show their involvement in the crime. Therefore, considering the nature and gravity of offence, no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

6. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

16.10.2024
Gyan

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |