

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

2025:PHHC:133465



217

CRM-M-13393-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision:24.09.2025.

Ravinder Kumar @ Ravinder

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

Present: Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunny Namdev, AAG, Haryana.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.283 dated 14.07.2023, under Sections 370, 406, 420, 120-B, 34 of IPC and Section 24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Madlauda, District Panipat.

As per prosecution, complainant Kamlesh Rani made a complaint to the police alleging therein that the petitioner, his wife Rekha and Mohit hatched a criminal conspiracy and in prosecution of common object to the said conspiracy, the said accused duped her of Rs.38 lakhs on the pretext of sending her son Sukhjeet Singh on working visa to America. On the basis of the said allegations, the FIR in question was registered against the accused persons. However, during investigation Mohit was found innocent.

Learned counsel for petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. There was delay in lodging of the FIR. The victim Sukhjeet Singh had himself made alterations in the documents including Passport etc. Though, the petitioner is involved in three other cases but in those cases the petitioner has already been granted bail. The petitioner is languishing in jail since 03.11.2023 and the conclusion of trial of the case will take considerable time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in further custody. Learned counsel, therefore, prays that the petitioner be granted concession of regular bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the present petition and submitted that the trial Court had already dismissed the two bail applications of the petitioner vide orders dated 23.07.2024 and 22.01.2025. The material prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined and the petitioner has not returned the hard earned money of the victim and as such, in view of the seriousness of the offence, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the case file.

In the present case, there are specific allegations against the petitioner that he had duped the complainant of Rs.38 lakhs on the pretext of sending her son Sukhjeet Singh on working visa to America. In pursuance of his disclosure statement, he got effected recovery of only Rs.20,000/- from his residential house in Shaktipuram, Karnal. The contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner are a matter of trial, which is still going on. As per status report, the petitioner is stated to be

involved in three other cases of similar nature.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, seriousness of the allegations and gravity of the alleged offence, it is not a fit case where the petitioner is to be granted concession of bail.

Accordingly, without having any bearing or expression of opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

24.09.2025.

Komal

Whether speaking/reasoned?	:	Yes/ No
Whether reportable?	:	Yes/ No