



131

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

**CRM-M-42500-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 12, 2024**

BALRAJ SINGH**....Petitioner(s)****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****....Respondent(s)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Anurag Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nikhil Chopra, Advocate and
Mr. Shubham, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J.(ORAL)

This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482
Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of anticipatory bail to the
petitioner in case FIR No.0079 dated 30.06.2024 under Sections 406, 420
IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professions (Regulation) Act 2014
(Sections 465, 468, 471 of IPC added later on vide Rapat No.28 dated
12.08.2024 and Section) registered at Police Station Nakodar Sadar, District
Jalandhar Rural.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is not willing to comply with
the previous order dated 06.09.2024 whereby he volunteered to pay
Rs.26,40,000/- as was credited to his account. Learned counsel for the
petitioner has changed his version today for extending the condition that he



is ready to pay the amount as offered on the last date of hearing subject to respondent-complainant agreeing to facilitate quashing of the FIR against him. The petitioner is not willing to accede to such concession of condition submitting that a total of Rs.48 lakhs was paid by him and major part of that is in cash for which he claims to have a video in which brother of the petitioner can be seen receiving some cash amount. He also asserts to have other material to produce in support of his assertion and therefore quashing of FIR would not arise at this stage.

In the light of above, having heard both the parties, on the previous date of hearing itself this Court does not deemed the present petition appropriate for accepting wherein respondent-complainant has been denied of his hard earned money to the tune of Rs.48 lakhs on account of sending abroad but neither the money is being repaid nor the promise made by the petitioner and his brother has been fulfilled.

In the light of above, the petition being devoid of any merit is dismissed, particularly considering the aspect that petitioner has failed to adhere before this Court qua his own undertaking tendered on the last date of hearing.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

12.09.2024
Sangeeta

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