

CRM-M-12825-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-12825-2025
Reserved on: 01.04.2025
Pronounced on: 08.04.2025

Surinder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. A.P.S. Rehan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Charitr Kadyan, Advocate for
Mr. Vinod K. Kaushal, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
278	17.12.2024	Sadar Amritsar, Police Commissionerate Amritsar, Distt. Amritsar	420 IPC and 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulations) Act 2014

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.
2. In paragraph 8 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from the status report dated 19.03.2025, which reads as follows:

“That the brief and relevant facts of the case are that the aforesaid FIR No. 278 dated 17.12.2024 was registered against the petitioner, as per the directions of the Commissioner of Police, Amritsar City after obtaining a legal opinion from District Attorney (Legal), Amritsar pursuant to a recommendation made by the Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police (Investigation), Amritsar City vide detailed enquiry report submitted in his office after verifying the facts alleged the complainant Kamaljit Kaur wife of Harjinder Singh in her complaint No. 8153-PC-COP dated 07.10.2024. The complainant had alleged in her aforesaid complains that the petitioner had committed cheating of Rs. 20 Lakh by giving a false

CRM-M-12825-2025

inducement of sending her son Anmol Singh to Canada by increasing his IELTS Band score but the petitioner neither sent her son Anmol Singh to Canada nor returned her money. The detailed facts mentioned by her in aforesaid complaint have been reproduced in the true translation of the FIR No. 278 dated 17.12.2024 attached with the petition as Annexure P-1, which may kindly be read as part of the present paragraph as same are not repeated here for the sake of brevity.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“Role of the petitioner

9. That as per the version of the complainant, the petitioner had cheated her by causing a wrongful loss of Rs. 20 Lakh by giving her a false inducement of sending her son Anmol Singh abroad and increasing an IELTS Band Score.”

REASONING:

7. Allegations against the petitioner are of cheating the complainant for an amount of Rs.20 lacs by making false promise to send his son to abroad, therefore petitioner is not entitled to bail. Para No.8 of the status report reflects transfer of amount in petitioner's account and for recovery of the same, custodial interrogation is necessary.

8. The sly way the petitioner conned the complainant points out the dangerous trend of the revival of thuggee by revisiting the history.

9. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for anticipatory bail. The impact of crime would also not justify anticipatory bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

10. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

11. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

08.04.2025

anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No