



220

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

CRM-M-37263-2024

Date of Decision:- 24.09.2024

LOVEPREET SINGH

....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Nikhil Tomar, Advocate, Mr. Adarshdeep Singh, Advocate
and Mr. Danish, Advocate for petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.86 dated 13.06.2024 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Salem Tabri, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

2. As per the facts of the case, complainant Sandeep Kaur filed written complaint against Lovepreet Singh, Richa, Vivek Pandey and Robin. It is submitted that complainant and her husband were planning to visit Australia. In April, 2023 accused Lovepreet Singh met them at her parental house in Ludhiana. In the presence of her family members he assured to arrange visa and air tickets and will complete all formalities. From time to time, he received Rs.28 lakhs which they had procured and also raised loan. All accused were hand in glove with each other. They procured one sponsorship letter from one Nixon Clarke which was found to be forged and fabricated. Said sponsor and mobile number were also fake. All the documents were forged and fabricated one and even the air tickets were fake, as a result they were not permitted to get boarding pass.

In this way, accused persons committed fraud with them.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that present petitioner is falsely implicated in this case. He had merely introduced the complainant with Edu. Global Vaidik Private Limited, Inderpuri, New Delhi. In-fact, entire amount was received by them. He is not involved in any other case. He is ready to join the investigation. Therefore, his anticipatory bail may be allowed.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed in which allegations levelled by complainant are confirmed. It is further pointed out that petitioner got transferred Rs.24.77 lakhs from complainant through google pay in the bank accounts and thereafter petitioner sent fake visa and tickets. Considering the nature of allegations, petitioner is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Facts mentioned in the FIR clearly indicates that it is a case of receiving huge amount on the pretext of sending complainant and her husband to foreign country and after receiving huge amount they were handed over fake visa and other travelling documents. Even Air Tickets were fake. Matter requires thorough investigation. Considering the gravity of offence, it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

24.09.2024
snd

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No.
Whether reportable: Yes/No