

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

(1) CRM-M-30083-2021 (O&M)

Rajbir Alias Ghanshyam ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another ...Respondents

(2) CRM-M-23215-2021 (O&M)

Iti Singh @ Tanisha ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another ...Respondents

Date of Decision:- 29.9.2022

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Karan Vir Nanda, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by ASI Deepak Kumar.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. This order shall dispose off the above mentioned two petitions filed on behalf of Rajbir Alias Ghanshyam and Iti Singh @ Tanisha seeking grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against them vide FIR No. 43 dated 13.2.2021 under Sections 10 and 24 of the Immigration Act, 1924 and under Sections 406, 420/120-B IPC (Sections 467, 468 and 471 added lateron) at Police Station Uchana, District Jind.
2. The FIR was lodged on the basis of a complaint made by Ajay and one Suresh wherein it is alleged that they are running an office under the name

and style of M/s Sarswati Center in Uchana Mandi wherein coaching is imparted. It is alleged that about one year back, they came in contact with Madam Tanisha Singh @ Iti Singh, who represented that she is into business of sending people abroad and introduced the complainants to one Deepak. The complainant, being taken in by the representations made by the said persons, transferred an amount of ₹ 8,27,000/- into the account of Deepak. The complainants, thereafter, were sent to Chennai alongwith Deepak for boarding a flight to Australia. The complainants were made to stay in Chennai for about six weeks and were thereafter handed over a VISA which was found to be forged. It is further alleged that an amount of ₹3,73,000/- was also given to Iti Singh @ Tanisha towards hotel expenses etc. The complainants, thus, alleged that they had been cheated of a total amount of ₹16,40,000/- by Tanisha Singh @ Iti Singh, Rajbir and Deepak in connivance with each other.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that although the petitioners are named in the FIR but there is no evidence to connect them with the alleged occurrence. It has further been submitted that the payments allegedly made by the complainant to the accused were not for the purpose of sending the complainants Ajay and Suresh abroad but were in respect of another person who had been granted VISA.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that during the course of investigation, it has been verified that an amount of ₹3,73,000/- had been received by petitioner Iti Singh @ Tanisha from the account of wife of complainant Suresh and that another amount of ₹30,000/-

had been received by Iti Singh @ Tanisha through *GooglePay*. The learned State counsel has further informed that the credit card belonging to wife of complainant Suresh had been extensively used by co-accused Deepak. It has been informed that although the petitioners Rajbir @ Ghanshyam and Iti Singh @ Tanisha have been granted interim bail but they are not cooperating and in fact have been furnishing fake addresses which had hampered investigation.

5. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the nature of allegations and the fact that there is evidence to substantiate passing of amount to petitioner/accused Iti Singh @ Tanisha and also that both the petitioners, who are stated to residing together are not cooperating and had furnished fake addresses, they do not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.
7. Both the petitions are sans merits and the same are hereby dismissed.
8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

29.9.2022

kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No