



104

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

**CRM-M-11490-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.03.2025**

Sandeep Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Amit Jaiswal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.56 dated 02.03.2024 under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Bawani Khera, District Bhiwani.

2. Briefly, the facts of the case are that FIR (*supra*) was registered on the basis of a complaint made by complainant Ashu Rani, on the allegations

2025:PHHC:036696



that she deposited Rs.3.20 lakhs in the bank account of the petitioner through RTGS in order to facilitate work visa and air ticket for Singapore. The petitioner provided visa, air ticket and work details to the complainant. The complainant verified the same through official website of Singapore Embassy and Indigo Airlines and found the visa as well as the air ticket as forged. Thereafter, she requested the petitioner to return the amount or to provide valid work visa, however, he refused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The complainant approached the petitioner for issuance of two work visas; one for herself and another for her friend and after doing all the documentation and other formalities by the petitioner, the complainant obtained work visas for herself and her friend. However, the complainant did not go abroad for the reasons best known to her. Further, the complainant had not paid the balance amount of Rs.3.20 lakhs and in this regard, the petitioner lodged a complaint against the complainant at District Court, Gautam Budh Nagar.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel appears on advance notice and opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is habitual offender and he is involved in one more case of similar nature. The office of the petitioner is lying closed for the last many months. The petitioner provided a fake visa and air ticket and induced the

2025:PHHC:036696



complainant to pay hefty amount, as such, his intention to cheat her from the very inception is writ large.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that the petitioner is involved in one more case with the similar allegations and he is habitual offender. As such, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to take the investigation to its logical end.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, without commenting anything further on merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the rights of either of the parties, this Court finds no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

18.03.2025
vishnu

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No