

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

**202**

**CRM-M No. 13230 of 2020  
Date of decision: 11.06.2020**

Rupinder Singh Sandhu @ Mani Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI**

Present : Mr.Vinay Kumar Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Mehta, Sr. DAG. Punjab  
for respondent-State.

Mr. Anoop Singla, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (ORAL)**

The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

The petitioner has filed the present (first) petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 140 dated 19.08.2019 registered under Sections 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'the IPC') at Police Station City Kotkapura, District Faridkot.

The above said FIR was lodged by complainant-Prem Kumar alleging that in the first week of June 2019, accused Deepinder Singh represented to the complainant to send him along with his wife to Canada and demanded amount of Rs.21,50,000/- and took passport of the complainant and his wife along with other documents. The complainant paid amount of Rs. 2,50,000/- to Deepinder Singh, Arvind Singh and Amandeep Kaur collectively on 21.06.2019 and thereafter paid amount

of Rs. 50,000/- to them on 13.07.2019. Accused Deepinder Singh and Amandeep Kaur came to the house of complainant on 14.07.2019 and took amount of Rs. 11,50,000/- from him. On 15.07.2019 Arvind Singh- father of co-accused Deepinder Singh received amount of Rs. 80,000/- from him. The accused dishonestly induced the complainant to pay total amount of Rs. 15,30,000/- but did not send him and his wife abroad. When the complainant demanded the return of amount from the family members of Deepinder Singh, they threatened to kill him.

The petitioner who is in custody since 17.02.2020 has filed the present petition for grant of regular bail.

The petition has been opposed by the learned State counsel and learned Counsel for the complainant. However, no reply has been filed.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioner, learned State Counsel and learned Counsel for the complainant and gone through the record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. There is no specific role attributed to him. The petitioner did not make any fraudulent representation or dishonest inducement to the complainant and did not receive any amount from him. Co-accused Deepinder Singh has already been granted regular bail by the trial Court vide order dated 13.11.2019. The trial is likely to take long time. No useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner in custody. Therefore, the petitioner may be granted regular bail.

On the other hand learned State Counsel and learned Counsel for the complainant have argued that the petitioner along with

his co-accused made fraudulent representation to the complainant and dishonestly induced him to pay amount of Rs. 15,30000/-. In view of the gravity of the accusation, the petitioner does not deserve grant of regular bail. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation against the petitioner, period of his custody, parity of case of the petitioner with that of his similarly placed co-accused Deepinder Singh who has been granted bail by the trial Court vide order dated 13.11.2019 and also the fact that the trial is likely to take long time but without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However bail is granted to the petitioner subject to the condition that he will not commit any similar offence after his release on bail and in case of commission of any similar offence by him, his bail order in the present case shall be liable to be cancelled on application to be filed by the prosecution in this regard.

**11.06.2020**

Rajeev (rvs)

**(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No