

S.No.218

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

CRM-M-16329 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision:13.05.2019

Ranjit Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present:- Mr. V.K. Sandhir, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Prabhjot Singh Walia, AAG,
Punjab.

Rajbir Sehrawat, J.(Oral)

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of bail pending trial in case FIR No.35 dated 01.02.2019 registered under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC read with Section 13 of Punjab Prevention of Human Smuggling Act, Police Station Beas Distt. Amritsar.

It is contended by counsel for the petitioner that admittedly the petitioner is having a licence of working as a Immigration Consultant under the relevant law. Although the complainant/victims had contacted the petitioner to avail her services for travelling abroad, however, they have concocted the story with altogether different facts. In fact, the petitioner had charged Rs.45,000/- each for providing consultancy as well as providing the tickets to travel to Dubai. It is even the case of the complainant/ victims that they, in fact, travelled to Dubai in lieu of the money paid to the petitioner. However, since the complainant/ victims were not interested in doing the work which they were provided at Dubai,

therefore, they had chosen to come back . After coming back, the complainant/ victims have made up the story just as a pressure tactics to get the money back from the petitioner, despite the fact that they had travelled to Dubai and stayed there for several days. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 02.02.2019. Challan has already been filed. The petitioner is not required for any investigation purposes.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, being instructed by ASI Jugal Kishore, submits that the passport of the victim/ complainants have been recovered from the petitioner. However, it is not disputed that the complainant/ victims had, in fact, travelled to Dubai for one month, although on tourist visa. It is also not disputed that the petitioner is not required for any investigation purposes.

In view of the above, but without commenting any further upon merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. It is ordered that the petitioner be released on his furnishing bail bonds/ sureties to the satisfaction of the trial Court/ Duty Magistrate.

May 13, 2019
renu

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No