



CRM-M-14050-2025

-1-

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

201

CRM-M-14050-2025

Date of decision : 01.04.2025

YUGANK

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Arjun Dosanjh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sanjay Jain, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has come up before this Court under Section 482 BNSS seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.591 dated 28.10.2024 under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

2. On 12.03.2025, the following order was passed:-

“ The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.591 dated 28.10.2024, under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is alleged that the petitioner had accepted huge amount from the complainants for getting them visa for Australia. He further contends that the petitioner himself is the victim of the fraud. However, he had introduced the complainants to the travel agent and, therefore, he had been involved in this case. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner has settled the matter with the complainant and has paid a sum of Rs.3.60 lakhs.

Mr. Sanjay Jain, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and submits that the cheque given by the petitioner for an amount of Rs.3,60,000/- has been dishonoured.



CRM-M-14050-2025

-2-

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is willing to pay the amount to the complainant within a period of one week.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State.

List on 18.03.2025.

The arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not paid any amount as directed in terms of order dated 12.03.2025.

4. In view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is not entitled to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail and the present petition is dismissed.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

01.04.2025*renu*

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