

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

CRM-M-8585-2024
Date of Decision: 09.04.2024
2024:PHHC: 048529

RAVINDER PAL SINGH

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

. . . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Ritesh Aggarwal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

By way of this petition filed under Section 439 CrPC, petitioner prays for his release on regular bail in case FIR No.38 dated 01.02.2023 under Sections 406/420 IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Sohana, Distt. SAS Nagar.

2. This is his second petition for regular bail. The earlier petition bearing CRM-M-32035-2023 was dismissed as withdrawn by this court by passing the following order on 8.11.2023 (Annexure P4): -

“Short reply on behalf of the respondent-State along with the custody certificate has been placed on record.

After arguing the case for some time, when this Court was not inclined to grant the relief of bail to the petitioner, statement is made by learned counsel for the petitioner so as to withdraw the present petition at this stage.

In view of the aforesaid statement, the present petition is dismissed as withdrawn at this stage.”

3. FIR was lodged on the complaint of Megha Rani, as per which she approached the office of petitioner, the owner of Prime Global Vision, Sector 66A, Industrial Area, SAS Nagar, who had given an advertisement on 'You Tube' and 'Instagram', that they used to provide foreign student visa to the interested persons. Complainant visited the office, where the girl named Ravneet was found, who assured that the company is providing the student visa for UK. On their asking, complainant paid an amount of ₹11,10,000/- on different dates from her account and from the account of her mother. Instead of giving visa for England as promised, the accused started making excuses. Rather, the petitioner closed the office. The amount was not returned to the complainant.

4. Ld. counsel contends that petitioner has been falsely implicated; that complainant had met Ravneet, who has already been granted bail; that petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year 1 month and 17 days, that the case is triable by Magistrate and so, he be granted bail.

5. Ld. State counsel not only drew attention towards the first order, which was passed by this Court, dismissing the earlier bail petition filed by the petitioner, but further drawn attention towards the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, who is involved in numerous cases of the similar in nature. Prayer is made for dismissing the petition.

6. Heard.

7. No doubt that as per the custody certificate, petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year 1 month and 17 days, but at the same time, it is noticed that he is involved in as many as six other cases, out of which four pertain to the similar nature. Not only this, on 22.02.2024, counsel for the

petitioner had sought adjournment to obtain instructions as to whether the petitioner was ready to return the cheated amount to the complainant. The response is in the negative. It is not disputed that the company, in the account of which, amount was deposited by the complainant, is owned by the petitioner.

8. Having regard to all the facts and circumstances, but without commenting anything further on merits of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner. As such, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

09.04.2024	(DEEPAK GUPTA)
<i>Vivek</i>	JUDGE
<i>Whether speaking/reasoned?</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>No</i>