



CRM-M-42902-2024

-1-

210

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

CRM-M-42902-2024

Date of Decision:- 05.11.2024

Pargat Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Gagandeep Singh Simble, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

Petitioner Pargat Singh has filed anticipatory bail petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No. 0201 dated 22.07.2024, under Section 420 of IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Batala, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur (Annexure P-1).

2. As per the facts of case, Varun Deep complainant filed written complaint against Pargat Singh owner of M/s Pargat Tour and Travels, Dera Road, Gill Market, near Batala Hospital, Batala, District Gurdaspur, alleging that he was introduced with Pargat Singh through Gulshan Singh. Complainant met the agent by going to his office who assured to arrange his Visa for Romania. He demanded ₹2,95,000/- for this work. He, in the presence of Gulshan Singh gave ₹20,000/- in cash on 15.07.2023,



CRM-M-42902-2024

-2-

₹15,000/- on 30.07.2023 alongwith his Passport. He again gave ₹2,25,000/- on 23.12.2023 in the presence of son of Gulshan Singh. He called said agent to inquire about his Visa. After some time, he handed over one offer letter and a Visa which were fake documents. He demanded back his money. Agent started putting off the matter on one pretext or the other. Ultimately, he entered into an agreement to return his money but he failed to return entire amount. On the basis of these allegations, present FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that he was falsely implicated in this case. Complainant has failed to show his source of money on the basis of which he claimed to have given ₹2,95,000/- to petitioner. His anticipatory bail petition has been wrongly declined by learned Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur. He is ready to join the investigation as and when required. Therefore, his anticipatory bail petition may be allowed.

4. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Status report is filed. It is pointed out that initially petitioner returned ₹70,000/- to complainant but failed to return balance amount. It was wrongly claimed by learned counsel for petitioner that entire amount has been returned and on that basis petitioner was granted *interim* bail by learned Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur. Later on, it was clarified that no further amount was returned by accused, which ultimately resulted into dismissal of his anticipatory bail application. However, it is conceded that no other criminal case is registered against present petitioner.



CRM-M-42902-2024

-3-

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. In the case in hand, present petitioner received huge amount from complainant on the pretext of sending him to Romania and in order to cheat him, handed over fake offer letter and Visa. Initially petitioner returned some amount but thereafter, refused to return remaining amount. Allegations are specific and serious in nature. Matter requires thorough investigation. Considering the specific allegations and its gravity, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner and accordingly, his anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

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

05.11.2024
lalit

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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