



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

222

CRM-M-24313-2026
Decided on : 07.07.2026

SARABJIT SINGH

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Gursharan Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant second petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), seeking grant of regular bail in case FIR No.66 dated 04.07.2025, under Section 316(2), 318(4) of BNS and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professional Regulation Act, 2014, registered at Police Station Mehitana, District Hoshiarpur.
2. The first bail petition filed by the petitioner has been withdrawn at that stage with liberty to file a fresh one vide order dated 19.02.2026 (Annexure P-3) in CRM-M-4129-2026.
3. FIR in the present case was got registered at the instance of the complainant-Himmat Singh who alleged that fraud of amount of Rs. 11,62,110/- has been done with him on pretext of getting employment and sending the daughter of complainant in South Korea. After receiving of the amount accused persons namely Sarabjit Singh (petitioner herein) Dalwinder Singh and Manjit Kaur neither sent daughter of complainant to South Korea nor returned the amount. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is in custody for the last 09 months and 10 days. The one of accused person namely Manjit Kaur, who got Rs.5 lacs transferred in her account, has been found innocent.

4. Learned State counsel make the position clear by submitting that co-accused Manjit Kaur is not actually beneficiary rather the said amount was transferred by her to the petitioner and petitioner received Rs.1 lac in his own bank account and Rs.5 lacs (in cash).

Out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, five material witnesses have already been examined and 7 are yet to be examined.

Learned State counsel, produces status report dated 03.07.2026 along with the custody certificate dated 06.07.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 09 months 10 days period inside jail.

5. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail in the present case, as allegations against petitioner are of an extremely grave and serious nature. Thus, prays for dismissed of bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances regarding the fraud of amount of Rs.11,62,110/- out of which amount was transferred into the bank account of petitioner would be a matter to be adjudicated upon by learned trial Court after appreciation of the evidence led by the parties.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record with their able assistance, this Court finds substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by



observing that petitioner is in custody for a period of 09 months 10 days and also all the offences are triable by Court of Magistrate, petitioner cannot be detained under the custody for a indefinite period.

8. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

07.07.2026

pry

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**