



CRM-M-17786-2025(O&M)

1

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

156+290

CRM-M-17786-2025(O&M)

Decided on: 08.04.2025

Aditya Gujrani

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Arora, Addl. P.P., U.T. Chandigarh.

Mr. Manjot Singh Rai, Advocate for
Mr. Amar Singh Chahal, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.**CRM-14643-2025**

i) Present application has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, seeking exemption from filing certified copies of memorandum of understanding/compromise deed dated 20.01.2025, 22.01.2025 and 24.02.2025 alongwith account statement/proof of amount transfer and for placing on record legible downloaded/photostat copies of the same as Annexure P-6 and P-7.

ii) It is noticed that application is completely misconceived as the title mentioned therein alongwith the details of the main case i.e. CRM-M-36232-2019 do not pertain to the present regular bail petition. Accordingly, same is hereby dismissed.

iii) On oral request of learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner, documents i.e. bank statement of the petitioner namely; Aditya Gujrani, appended with the application are taken on record, for the

**CRM-M-17786-2025(O&M)****2**

purpose of considering the plea of regular bail of the petitioner. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper-book.

CRM-M-17786-2025(O&M)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 17 dated 03.02.2025, under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 340(2), 61(2) BNS, 2023 and Section 24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station East Sector 26, Chandigarh

2. By referring to the allegations mentioned in the FIR, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that in the complaint got lodged at the instance of Sangeeta Rani, it has been alleged that the office of Immigration Company is being run by the petitioner in the name of EIC Visa, SCO No. 17, 2nd floor, Sector 7-C, Chandigarh, and for getting immigration services for her son namely; Ujjwal Khosla, an amount of Rs.2,13,000/- had been deposited in the bank account of the company. Subsequently, neither required Visa was arranged for her son; nor the documents or the amount was returned, rather office was found closed.

3. Learned senior counsel while referring to the bank account statement of the petitioner, submits that at different occasions, total sum of Rs.2,40,000/- has already been transferred in the bank account of son of complainant namely; Ujjwal Khosla, and Rs.27,000/- is paid over and above the alleged amount. Counsel further submits that petitioner is in custody for the last one month and fifteen days period. Also submits that the offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate and; culmination of trial is likely to take considerable time, thus, prays for grant of regular bail.



4. On the other hand, while opposing the prayer of the petitioner, learned counsel for U.T. Chandigarh and complainant jointly, submit that petitioner is an habitual offender and cheated many other persons and there are other cases also of similar nature, registered against the petitioner. However, counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant admits the receiving of amount of Rs.2,40,000/- in the bank account of Ujjwal Khosla, but submits that one year of the complainant's son has gone in waste just because of the petitioner. Thus, prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Looking at the circumstances in its entirety and the fact that more than the substantial amount has already been returned by the petitioner, and at this stage personal liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed for indefinite period. Also the fact that the offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate and culmination of trial is likely to take considerable time, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6 Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.



CRM-M-17786-2025(O&M)

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 08, 2025
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO