



CRM-M-48120-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(102)

CRM-M-48120-2024
Date of Decision : 05.11.2024

Jasvir Singh ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. R.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, DAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, the petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.86 dated 21.08.2024 (Annexure P-2), under Sections 420 and 120-B of the IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Sadar Raikot, District Ludhiana Rural, Punjab.
2. On asking for the relief (supra), learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he has introduced the main accused to the complainant. He further submits that the petitioner has not received any disputed amount, as alleged in the FIR (supra). While referring to Annexure P-3, a photocopy of the affidavit, alleged to have been sworn by the complainant and the present petitioner collectively, regarding their exclusive cost of living and expenses, during their stay at Phillipines, submits that there is no substance in the allegations. He also submits that the petitioner himself is a victim of fraud played by the main accused, as his passport was also snatched, and he had to apply for a new passport. In addition, he submits that there is a delay of five and half

**CRM-M-48120-2024****2**

month in lodging the FIR (supra). Furthermore, he submits that the reason of deportation from Phillipines is that one complaint has been filed by a lady against the present complainant, which led to his deportation.

3. In deference to the order dated 14.10.2024, reply dated 01.11.2024, by way of affidavit of Mr. Harjinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Raikot, District Ludhiana (Rural), on behalf of the respondent-State of Punjab, furnished by the learned State counsel today in the Court. The same is taken on the record. Copy thereof, supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. This Court has considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the reply (supra), filed by the learned State counsel, to the instant petition, and is of the considered view that the instant petition is amenable to be dismissed, on account of serious allegations against the present petitioner.

5. The FIR (supra), has been registered on the complaint made by one Jaswinder Singh, stating therein, that the petitioner, firstly, made acquaintance with the complainant, and thereupon, he started alluring him, on the pretext of sending him abroad, and thereafter, he introduced the complainant with Sukhwinder Singh @ Tattu, and Rupinder Kaur, wife of Sukhwinder Singh. He claimed himself to be their partner, for sending the people abroad. Finally, when the complainant was allured into the bluff of the petitioner, and he was assured that initially, he will be sent to Phillipines (Manila), on sponsorship, and, thereafter, he will be sent to a bigger country, for an amount of Rs.21,00,000/-. It was the petitioner, who took all the documents and made the complainant to transfer the amount on various occasions, and in different accounts. The gist of such transfer is extracted



Sr. No.	Date	Amount in Rs.	Payment Mode	Account No(s).	A/c holder name
1.	06.03.2023	6,200/-	Google Pay	-	-
2.	28.03.2023	50,000/-	Bank A/c	920010031361682	-
3.	30.03.2023	8,500/-	Google Pay	-	Amaninder Singh
4.	31.03.2023	1,50,000/-	Various transactions	50100217897100	-
5.	01.04.2023	5,00,000/-	Cash	-	Jasvir Singh
6.	17.04.2023	2,25,000/-	Various transactions	7527000100036324	Rajinder Singh
7.	18.04.2023	25,000/-	-	-do-	-do-
8.	03.05.2023	2,19,000/-	Different transactions	15010100025419	-
	04.05.2023			501003581543	

6. In the FIR (supra), there are specific allegations that the petitioner has received an amount of Rs.5,00,000/-, on dated 01.04.2023, in the presence of one, Harwindhar Singh. The document, which has been placed on record, rather, score the case of the complainant, that the petitioner remained present at Manila, where the complainant was not only tortured, however, he was kept confined, and more money was extorted from him at Manila. It is a serious case of human trafficking, in which the present petitioner, played an active role. As per the reply, the FIR (supra), has been registered after due inquiry, wherein, the allegations, as alleged against the petitioner, has been found to be correct.

7. In view of the gravity of the offence and the specific allegations against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant the asked for relief to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is **dismissed**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

November 05, 2024
Manpreet