



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

**CRM-M-11935-2025  
DECIDED ON: 04.03.2025**

**RAJ KUMAR**

**.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

**.....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Harchand Singh Bath, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

<b>Name &amp; age of Petitioner (s)</b>	<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Section(s)</b>	<b>Police Station</b>	<b>District</b>
Raj Kumar, aged about 67 years	13	24.01.2025	420, 120-B IPC, 1860	City Patti	Tarn Taran

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that there is an allegation of making payment to the petitioner of Rs.5.5 lacs in total, and said incident has been recorded on a mobile phone.

3. Counsel for the petitioner refers to the fact that an inquiry into the complaint was conducted by the DSP. However, the SSP of Tarn Taran raised certain objections, questioning the discrepancy in the amount, whether it is Rs.4 lacs, Rs.8.50 lacs, or Rs.5.5 lacs. The SSP also

sought clarification on this matter as well as verification of the sources from which the complainant acquired the amount.

Counsel for the petitioner argues that once, the objections were raised, pointing out the contradictory stand of the complainant-party in regard to the money paid to the petitioner, there is no surety of his version being truthful.

Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant, and files his *vakalatnama* in Court today, which is taken on record.

6. Learned State counsel submits that petitioner, in fact, is involved in the crime, and while he was receiving the amount paid by the complainant, same was recorded in the mobile phone.

7. After going through the materials available on record and hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties, this Court finds no substantial reason to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as the complainant has been allured, and subsequently, deceived by the petitioner.

8. Thus, present petition is **dismissed**.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

04.03.2025

*Lavisha*

*Whether speaking/reasoned*      *Yes/No*

*Whether reportable*              *Yes/No*