



104

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

Date of decision: 26.03.2025

1. CRM-M-13059-2025 (O&M)

Pushpinder

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

2. CRM-M-13990-2025 (O&M)

Sonam Guraung

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

3. CRM-M-13979-2025 (O&M)

Sonam Guraung

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Karan Singla, Advocate and
Ms. Malvi Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-13059-2025).

Mr. N.S. Mahal, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-13990 & 13979-2025).

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the complainant/respondent No.2
(in CRM-M-13059 & 13990-2025).

Mr. Sahil Goel, Advocate
for complainant-respondent No.2 (in CRM-M-13979-2025).

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This order shall dispose of aforementioned three petitions filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail to petitioners Pushpinder and Sonam Guraung in FIR No.129 and to petitioner Sonam Guraung in FIR No.128, both FIRs dated 10.04.2024 under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. Compactly, the facts of the case are that the petitioners along with co-accused, on the pretext of providing job of Peon in Punjab National Bank, received huge amount from the complainants in their bank accounts and thereafter, neither the job was arranged for them nor returned the amount. Hence, the FIRs (*supra*).



3. Learned counsel for petitioner Pushpinder, *inter alia*, contends that the amount paid by the complainant to the petitioner is Rs.3.50 lakhs as per case set up by the prosecution. The petitioner has already transferred Rs.3.10 lakhs in the account of co-accused Sonam Guraung. Further, the balance amount of Rs.50,000/- has been paid to the complainant and the petitioner has no role to play in the alleged incident. The complainant, in spite of filing a suit for recovery, has got registered FIR No.129 (*supra*) by twisting the facts.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner Sonam Guraung, *inter alia*, contends that there are no allegations against the petitioner that she induced the complainant on the pretext of providing any govt. job. The amount received from co-accused Pushpinder has already been returned to him and there is no evidence available on record against the petitioner to connect her with the alleged offence.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant/respondent No.2, opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners on the ground that they have duped the innocent citizens on the pretext of providing govt. jobs and they are involved in three more FIRs of similar nature, where the allegations are regarding obtaining hefty amount by inducing the complainants therein to provide employment in govt. departments.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that the petitioners are



habitual offenders and they are involved in three more FIRs of similar nature. There are serious allegations against the petitioners and intention to cheat the complainant/respondent No.2 from the very inception is writ large and to dispel the public perception that govt. jobs can be procured by paying the amount, which creates a doubt on the integrity of selection process and has also larger ramifications in the society, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the allegations of cheating levelled against the petitioners, this Court finds no ground to grant them the concession of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, all these three petitions are dismissed.

7. However, nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and learned trial Court shall decide the case(s) on its own merits without being prejudiced by the observations of this Court.

8. Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of connected cases.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

26.03.2025

vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No