



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

104

CRM-M-9484-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 19.02.2025

MANPREET SINGH

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. SP Soi, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)1. Relief Sought

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 42 dated 30.04.2024 U/S 406/420 of IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014. PS Bhogpur, District Jalandhar i.e. Annexure P-1.

2. Prosecution story, set up in the present case as per the version in the FIR reads as under :-

‘Complaint against against Manpreet Singh S/o Surinder Pal R/o Bajuha Kalan District Jalandhar for sending him to abroad Italy and to defrauded him for amounting Rs 10,70,000/-. Dear Sir, It is stated that I Sukhchain Singh S/o Mohan Singh R/o Kharal Kalan Tehsil Bhogpur, District Jalandhar. That the above said Manpreet Singh who is working as a travel agent. That the Manpreet Singh is well known to me. That he on the instance of sending me abroad Italy told me on many occasions to deposit in his account no. 31840100002982



*of Bank of Baroda Branch Bhogpur Jalandhar defrauded me copy of bank statements are attached and Rs 2,90,000/- took from me at Ramamandi Jalandhar and one time at Chugiti Bridge. That Manpreet Singh nor returning my money nor he is sending me abroad Italy. That he is lingering around and requesting me for some time to pay my money back. That on 10.03.2023 Manpreet Singh told me to return my money back but only yesterday he left his house. That when I asked him for my money he always starting using unparliamentary language and threaten me to life. Therefore it is requested before you that kindly take appropriate action against above said accused and bring my money back. I am very thankful to you. Your's faithfully
Sd/-Sukhchain Singh son of S/o Mohan Singh R/o Kharal Kalan Tehsil Bhogpur District Jalandhar M.No. 9815473546.'*

3. **Contentions**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as the complainant was earlier a Car dealer and both the petitioner and the complainant are dealing in this business but later one, they started working as Travel Agents. He submits that the petitioner deals in air tickets with travel agency and has got license for the same, whereas the complainant works as travel agent and the amount was transferred only for the purchase of tickets. He further submits that the allegations levelled by the complainant are only after thoughts whereas no concrete evidence is available with the prosecution to substantiate its version. It is his further contention that the dispute involved in the present case is civil in nature which has been given criminal colour only to harass the petitioner.



Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice on instructions from Investigating Officer vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of concession of anticipatory bail stating that the complainant had transferred Rs 7,86,900/- in petitioner's account and Rs 3,00,000/- was given as cash but he was not sent abroad after receiving the money, therefore, prays for dismissal of the petition.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, *prima facie* it appears that there are multiple transactions between the petitioner and the complainant namely Sukhchain Singh who is also involved in the business of travel agent and apparently was corroboration with the petitioner wherein now certain dispute seems to have arisen for some amount which may allegedly have been collected by the petitioner and not credited in the account of the complainant.

Since it is a dispute of above stated nature wherein the complainant and the petitioner are working as travel agents and money was transferred in the account of the petitioner for purchase of the tickets, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by sending him behind the bars in as much as undertaking has been given by counsel for the petitioner before this Court that the petitioner has bona fide intentions and is willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of



the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency within the stipulated time period. Hence, this Court finds no reason to deny the petitioner the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. **Relief**

Hence, in view of the admitted set of circumstances before this Court, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation and reporting to the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS of which are reproduced below :-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’



However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stand cancelled.

The petition in the aforesaid terms stand allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

19.02.2025
anuradha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>