



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

CRM-M No.47565 of 2024
Date of decision: 23rd September, 2024

Shakti Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Rajvir S. Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 482 BNSS in case FIR No.359 dated 09.08.2024 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468 of the IPC registered at Police Station City Gohana, District Sonipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case for allegedly cheating the complainant and his friend of a sum of ₹22,60,000/- on the pretext of sending them abroad with forged and fake visas. It is further argued that the actual dispute between the parties is civil in nature, and the allegations levelled against the petitioner are completely unfounded and devoid of merit. Learned counsel asserts that the petitioner himself is a victim of fraud perpetrated by respondent No.3 who operates a visa company by the name of Planet Visa Solution.



3. He further submits that out of the total sum of ₹90.00 lacs, which was given to respondent No.3, an amount of ₹20.00 lacs had come from his own personal funds, and this entire transaction took place in the presence of the complainant and other witnesses. Learned counsel has further argued that no offence of cheating is made out against the petitioner. In fact, the petitioner has already lodged a complaint with SSP Chandigarh, against respondent No.3, but the investigation in that matter has been inexplicably delayed for reasons known only to respondent No.4. It has also been admitted that prior also, a similar case was registered against the petitioner, he had repaid the amount in dispute. The complainant, in the instant case, having learnt of his previous settlement, allegedly misled the police and framed the petitioner as a scapegoat in an attempt to extort money from him.

4. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is willing to cooperate with the Investigating Agency and will join the investigation whenever required by the police. Moreover, since nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner, his custodial interrogation would not be required.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

6. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious. Allegedly, the petitioner, in collusion with the other accused persons, duped the complainant by promising to send him to Australia and his



friend to Canada in exchange for ₹22,60,000/-. The petitioner is further alleged to have provided the complainant with a forged visa, and, when the complainant and others demanded their money back, the petitioner not only refused to refund the money, but also threatened the complainant with dire consequences. It is pertinent to point out that there are specific allegations of cheating and issuing threats directly against the petitioner, and pertinently, he was the one who attested an affidavit which though failed to disclose the purpose of the monetary exchange related to facilitating travel abroad, but it did acknowledge the money transaction between the parties. It is disturbing to note that unscrupulous travel agents and individuals, continue to exploit the aspirations of people longing to move abroad by dangling the false hope of a better future in exchange of large sums of money. These fraudulent actors are preying on the vulnerability of people who are willing to part with their life-savings in pursuit of greener pastures, only to be deceived by false promises and fake documents. Stringent actions are necessary to protect innocent people from falling victim to these criminal schemes.

7. Given the nature and allegations and growing number of such fraudulent cases where innocent people are duped of their hard earned money with false promises of opportunities abroad, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessitated for a thorough investigation.



8. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove and the role allegedly attributed to the petitioner, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition stands dismissed. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

September 23, 2024
rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No