



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-12237-2025
DECIDED ON: 05.03.2025

MANPREET SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Relief sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in F.I.R. No. 188, dated 29.08.2024 under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, 1860 registered at Police Station City Kotkapura, District Faridkot.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

“Today an application No. 1217-PC-8/24 dated 02.07.2024 by Virpal Kaur etc. Mobile: 90410-29108, against Rupinder Kaur Wife Gurmail Singh Resident House No. 498, Hari Nau Road, Kotkapura, Nirmala Rani wife of Krishna Lal, Raj Kumar son of Krishna Lal Residents of Village Giljewala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, Rajni Bala wife of Raj Kumar Resident of Village Giljewala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, Inderjit Kaur wife of Dharamvir Singh Resident of Machaki Mall Singh Road, Guru Teg Bahadur Nagar, Faridkot, after investigation Deputy Superintendent of Police SubDivision

Faridkot, after comment Superintendent Police (PBI and Inve:) Faridkot upon orders of Hon'ble Senior Superintendent Police Faridkot was received at Police Station for registration of case, the contents of which are as under: "To, Hon'ble SSP Sahib, Punjab Police Faridkot, complaint against (1) Nirmala Rani (Mobile. 98788- 90067) wife Krishna Lal, Rajni wife Raju Kumar (Mob. 90412- 17201) (3) Raju Kumar S/o Krishna Lal r/o Chaoprean wala Bagh Gali No. 5 Kotkapura District Faridkot. (4) Parveen Kaur alias Inderjit Kaur alias Bandu, wife of Bittu Fauji Sahota alias Dharamvir Singh (Mob. 91154- 72625, 98760-02190, 85570-86253, 76961-78172, 77102-84952, 98783- 09064 resident of Machaki Mall Singh road, Teacher Colony Street No.4 Near Gurdwara Sahib Ishar Prakash District Faridkot (5) Manpreet Singh (Mob. 94170-28076) son of not known (6) Angrez Singh alias Bantu son of Seera Singh (7) Seera Singh (Mob. 77102-84952) s/ o not known r/o V. Marar, Tehsil and Distt. Faridkot (8) Duggal and Amarjit Kaur (9) Rupinder Kaur (Mob. 82849-26620) w/o Mela Singh regarding fraud of Rs. 80 lakh. Sir, regarding the above subject I request that I am Virpal Kaur wife of Sh. Gurmeet Singh resident Dashmesh Nagar Jalalabad District Fazilka etc. That I met Nirmala Rani abovesaid at some wedding, who described herself as a finance worker. As I needed money, I agreed to take a loan from her side. Upon which she told me about the loan given by the Modi government and said that for this you have to make about 50 members and all of them will get a loan from the government. 43 members were made and 60 lakh rupees were collected by all of us and deposited in different accounts of the persons under the said subject, the proof of which is available with us, and I am ready to present it as evidence on the spot. After which we have been harassed by the persons under the said subject for almost 2 years and they kept lingering on and neither our loan pass nor our principal amount is being refunded to us. We were deceived by the abovesaid and they asked for one and a half lakh rupees per person to pass the loan and then we gathered our relatives

and some friends and with that we have got 43 members together, to whom they had to get the loan passed. Among them, few were very poor and they could not pay this money at the first instance, and then as the money was being collected, Nirmala Rani, wife Krishna Lal, kept coming and taking money from our house from time to time as we sold the combine and in this way also gave some money from our accounts, thus kept on depositing about 45 lakh rupees in their accounts online. Accounts in which 94171-39364, Manpreet Singh's account 94170-28076, Devinder Kaur Brar and 70557-57354, Sanjeev Kumar 98721-13974, Vijay Kumar (the details of which we can present as evidence. And then these persons kept on linger on us for almost 2 years, and we are having their phone recordings and we can present it as evidence. From this, the money of some persons has been returned by Veerpal Kaur at her own level by selling her house and articles of her house. Apart from me and 43 members, some other persons have been cheated by them of around Rs. 20 lakhs. Abovesaid persons now are threatening us and no one is picking up our phone. Abovesaid persons are now absconders and we do not know their whereabouts and the addresses given by them where they were staying, now they are not available there. Please take strict action against abovesaid persons as they had made a gang and had cheated different persons for amount of about Rs. 80 lakhs and for deceiving us and our money be got returned. We all members belong to poor families and this amount is too big for us, due to which we are suffering financially and mentally. So please take action against abovesaid persons as soon as possible and our claim be satisfied. We shall be very grateful.”

3. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there are actually 43 members in the alleged committee who all are demanding their

amount from the complainant, who succeeded in registration of the instant FIR with an ulterior motive to get rid of the liability of returning the said amount which she had collected by making wrongful promises to the said investors. He would further assert that actual culprit is one Veerpal Kaur who managed everything and is wondering scot-free by getting the present petitioner and other co-accused persons falsely implicated in the present case in order to save herself from the criminal proceedings. He would also rely upon “*Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia versus State of Punjab*”, 1980(2) SCC 565 to assert that a bail is to be considered in the light of cumulative effect on variety of circumstances and even the accused of non-bailable offences are entitled to such concession in case *prima facie* case is not established against the accused. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that the present petitioner is on better footing than co-accused namely Inderjeet Kaur, who has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 30.09.2024 (Annexure P-3) passed in CRM-M-48753-2024.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, who seeks dismissal of the instant petition urging that out of alleged amount of Rs.86 lacs, some amount was credited in the account of the present petitioner, meaning thereby the petitioner was a beneficiary to some of the amount.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, looking into the facts and circumstances after considering the submissions made on behalf of learned counsel for the parties and the fact that no specific allegation with regard to quantum of

amount has been put forth by learned State counsel during the course of hearing and, therefore, the case of the petitioner seems to be at better footing than co-accused Inderjeet Kaur, who has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 30.09.2024 passed in CRM-M-48753-2024, this Court in the light of having vague allegations without any specific incriminating material against the present petitioner deems it a fit case to allow the present petitioner anticipatory bail.

5. **Relief**

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction for the reason that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required as it would be of no fruitful purpose to put the petitioner behind the bars. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 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 a period of one week and comply with the aforesaid condition under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

05.03.2025

Poonam Negi

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No