



CRM-M-45342-2024

-1-

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

214

CRM-M-45342-2024

Date of Decision:- 11.11.2024

Naresh Tomar

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Sobti, Advocate for petitioner.

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

Mr. Ritesh Tomar, Advocate for complainant.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner Naresh Tomar has filed second petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.0342 dated 05.07.2023, under Section 120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC, registered at Police Station Adarsh Nagar, District Faridabad.

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Vijender Singh filed written complaint alleging that Naresh Tomar and Smt. Tomar demanded Rs.6,00,000/- to secure a job for his son Vishnu of Ticket Checker in railways. On allurement given by them, he handed over cash of Rs.2,50,000/- to both of them and remaining amount of Rs.3,50,000/- were transferred in their accounts. After some time, he enquired about the said

**CRM-M-45342-2024****-2-**

job and further asked them to return his money. On this, accused persons started threatening him. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner pointed out that his first anticipatory bail petition bearing CRM-M-29773-2024 was withdrawn for effecting compromise vide order dated 23.07.2024 (Annexure P-4). All allegations levelled against petitioner are false. He has not received any amount. Statement of account of petitioner is Annexure P-2. Allegations are without any basis. He is ready to join the investigation. Therefore, his second anticipatory bail petition may be allowed.

4. Mr. Ritesh Tomar, Advocate appeared on behalf of complainant and filed vakalatnama, which is taken on record.

5. Learned counsel representing State opposed the bail petition. Detailed status report is already filed. It is pointed out that present petitioner is specifically named in the FIR who along with his wife allured complainant to give huge amount on the pretext of providing job for his son. Co-accused Rekha Tomar has been granted bail. She had joined investigation and in her disclosure statement (Annexure R-2), she specifically named petitioner for receiving money. Present petitioner had handed over photocopies of certain documents to complainant regarding job i.e. joining letter (Annexure R-4), list of attendance (Annexure R-5) and Identity Card (Annexure R-6). Said documents are not clear and the same are yet to be recovered from petitioner/accused. His custodial interrogation is required to complete the investigation and to recover the original documents. Therefore, he is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.



CRM-M-45342-2024

-3-

6. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. Present petitioner is specifically named in the FIR. He is yet to join the investigation. Allegations are specific and serious in nature. He allegedly handed over some fake documents to the complainant and the said documents are yet to be recovered in original.

7. Considering the gravity of offence and huge amount involved in this case, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

11.11.2024

Sunil Devi

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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