



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(212) CRM-M-14619-2025(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 24.03.2025

Jaspreet KaurPetitioner

VERSUS

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present Mr.G.S.Ghuman, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Amit Rana, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Kulwinder Pal Kaur Gill, Advocate,
for complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.0089 dated 09.11.2024 under Sections 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Samalsar, District Moga.

2. Status report by way of affidavit of Dalbir Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Baghapurana, District Moga, filed by learned State counsel in Court today, is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to the counsel opposite.

3. The allegations against the petitioner pertain to a large-scale fraud wherein the victims were allegedly induced to part with substantial sums of money on the false promise of obtaining visas and facilitating their travel abroad. As per the FIR Annexure P-1, the complainant along with several other victims, was assured of work and family visas to Australia and Canada by the



petitioner, her husband co-accused Manjit Singh and other co-accused. It is alleged that a total sum of Rs.2.5 crores was fraudulently collected, out of which Rs.35,00,000/- was received in cash in the presence of the petitioner. Despite receiving such a hefty amount, no visas were arranged, nor was the money returned.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is innocent and has no previous criminal antecedents and that there is no evidence of direct monetary transaction between her and the complainant or the other victims. It is also submitted that all financial dealings were between the complainant and the petitioner's husband co-accused Manjit Singh.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail, by drawing the attention of this Court to the specific allegations and role attributed to the petitioner in the FIR in question. It is pointed out by the learned State counsel that the petitioner was present and actively participated in talks with the complainant and other victims when an amount of Rs.35,00,000/- was handed to the accused. Furthermore, it has also been brought to the attention of this Court that the petitioner is booked in another similar case registered in the State of Uttar Pradesh which clearly indicates her involvement in such like fraudulent activities.

6. The learned State counsel has further contended that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to unearth the whole extent of the conspiracy, identify other victims and trace the flow of funds. It is also argued that the petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands as her criminal antecedents have been withheld; granting her anticipatory bail would hamper the investigation.

7. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant record, this Court finds that the allegations against the petitioner are not only serious but also specific. The material on record prima facie indicates her active participation in the fraudulent scheme which allegedly duped innocent and vulnerable individuals of their hard-earned money on the pretext of securing foreign visas.

8. The gravity of the offence is compounded by the fact that such fraudulent activities have become alarmingly prevalent, with unsuspecting victims being misled into parting with huge sums of money in the hope of better opportunities abroad. Such crimes have far-reaching consequences, but also erode public trust in legitimate immigration processes.

9. Furthermore, the fact that the petitioner is already implicated in a similar case in the State of Uttar Pradesh re-enforces the apprehension that she may be involved in a wider network of such fraudulent activities. Given the nature of allegations, the complexity of the investigation, and the necessity of custodial interrogation to trace the money trail and uncover the full extent of the conspiracy, this Court finds no ground to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

11. It is clarified that nothing contained here-in-above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

24.03.2025
mamta

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No