

CRM-M-15858-2025
CRM-M-25526-2025
CRM-M-30333-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-15858-2025
Reserved on: 03.09.2025
Pronounced on: 16.09.2025

Paramjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CRM-M-25526-2025

Jatinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CRM-M-30333-2025

Hardeep Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. G.S. Randhawa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, D.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
004	09.01.2025	Mehta, Police District Amritsar Rural	420, 120-B IPC

1. Vide this common order, CRM-M No.15858 of 2025, CRM-M No.25526 of 2025 and CRM-M No.30333 of 2025 are being disposed of. For brevity, the facts are being taken from CRM-M No.15858 of 2025.

2. The petitioner(s) apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above have come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023,

CRM-M-15858-2025
CRM-M-25526-2025
CRM-M-30333-2025

[BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

3. Per status report, the petitioners have no criminal antecedents.

4. The facts and allegations are being taken from the status report filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“2. That the brief and relevant facts of the case are that the aforesaid FIR No. 04 dated 09.01.2025 was registered as per the directions of Senior Superintendent of Police, Amritsar (Rural) after obtaining legal opinion from District Attorney (Legal), Amritsar pursuant to the recommendation made by Deputy Superintendent of Police, Crime Against Women and Children, Amritsar (Rural) vide detailed enquiry report submitted by him in his office after verifying the allegations of the complainant Sukhwinder Kaur made in the complaint 1264-AP dated 07.08.2024. The complainant Sukhwinder Kaur had alleged in her aforesaid complaint the petitioner, co-accused Jaspreet Kaur, Dharamjit Singh, Hardeep Kaur, Kuljinder Kaur and Jatinder Singh in connivance and conspiring with each other had committed cheating with her by causing her a wrongful loss of Rs. 17,50,000/- by giving a false inducement of taking her son Ranjodh Singh to Canada after solemnizing marriage with Jaspreet Kaur but neither Jaspreet Kaur solemnize marriage with her son Ranjodh Singh and took her son to Canada nor the aforesaid accused returned her money. The detailed facts mentioned by her in aforesaid complaint have been reproduced in the true translation of the FIR No. 04 dated 09.01.2025 attached with the petition as Annexure P-1, which may kindly be read as part of this paragraph please as same are not repeated for the sake of brevity.”

5. 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.

6. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioners would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioners repeat the offense or commit any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioners shall have no objection.

7. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the status report.

8. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the status report, which read as follows:

“Role of the petitioner (Paramjit Singh)

CRM-M-15858-2025
CRM-M-25526-2025
CRM-M-30333-2025

4. That as per the version of the complainant, the petitioner in connivance and conspiring with other nominated accused, had cheated her by causing a wrongful loss of Rs. 17,50,000/- by giving a false inducement of taking her son Ranjodh Singh to Canada after solemnizing marriage with Jaspreet Kaur but neither Jaspreet Kaur solemnize marriage with her son Ranjodh Singh and took her son to Canada nor the aforesaid accused returned her money and during the investigation, it was found that Rs. 4,30,000/- was deposited in the account of the wife of the petitioner.

Role of the petitioner (Jatinder Singh)

6. That as per the version of the complainant Sukhwinder Kaur, the petitioner in connivance and conspiring with the co-accused Jaspreet Kaur, Paramjit Singh, Hardeep Kaur and Kuljinder Singh had cheated her by giving her a false inducement of sending her son Ranjodh Singh to Canada after his marriage with Jaspreet Kaur. During the investigation, it was found that an amount of Rs. 4 Lakh was transferred by the complainant Sukhwinder Kaur on 11.03.2024 in the account of the petitioner.

Role of the petitioner (Hardeep Kaur)

6. That as per the version of the complainant Sukhwinder Kaur, the petitioner in connivance and conspiring with the co-accused Jaspreet Kaur, Paramjit Singh, Hardeep Kaur and Kuljinder Singh had cheated her by giving her a false inducement of sending her son Ranjodh Singh to Canada after his marriage with Jaspreet Kaur. During the investigation, it was found that an amount of Rs. 4 Lakh 33 Thousand was transferred by the complainant Sukhwinder Kaur on 15.04.2024 in the account of the petitioner.”

9. Allegations against the petitioner(s) are that they induced the complainant with false promise to send her son with their daughter after marriage to Canada and under this assurance, they cheated her. As per status report, an amount of Rs.4,33,000/- was found transferred in the account of petitioner Hardeep Kaur and Rs.4 lacs in the account of Jatinder Singh. Per paragraph 4 of CRM-M-25526-2025, all the amount came to the account of petitioner Hardeep Kaur. Per the petition of Hardeep Kaur, said amount was transferred as fee of Jaspreet Kaur. Complainant's one son per FIR is already in Canada and second who wants to marry returned from England, which shows that they were not rustic but were well aware qua the visa, residency or travel to abroad. Prima facie evidence is not sufficient to deny bail to the petitioner(s).

10. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage, but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.

CRM-M-15858-2025
CRM-M-25526-2025
CRM-M-30333-2025

11. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioners make a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

12. Given above, provided the petitioner(s) are not required in any other case, the petitioner(s) shall be released on anticipatory bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

13. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner(s) shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

14. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

15. The petitioner(s) are directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner(s) shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner(s) shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner(s) shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

16. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

CRM-M-15858-2025
CRM-M-25526-2025
CRM-M-30333-2025

17. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioners another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioners also abide by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

18. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioners repeat the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

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

20. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioners can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

21. **Petition(s) allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

16.09.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.