



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

CRM-M-20747-2025

Reserved on: 16th May, 2025

Pronounced on: 20th May, 2025

Minku @ Karamveer

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Singh Jattan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 65 dated 13.03.2025 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 506 of IPC at Police Station Baldev Nagar, District Ambala.

2. As per the allegations, the accused Kaptan Singh along with the present petitioner, had induced the complainant to part with a sum of Rs. 32,00,000/- on the pretext of sending and settling the family of the complainant, as well as himself, in the United States of America and had caused wrongful loss to him as instead of getting visa for USA, issued a false and fake visa had been given to him. The said Visa was of Azerbaijan



country instead of USA. When the complainant asked the accused, petitioner and co-accused to return his money, he was threatened. On his complaint, the aforementioned FIR has been registered. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail, which has been dismissed by the Court of Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala. vide order dated 16.04.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is inordinate delay in the lodging of the FIR. Even as per the allegations in the complaint, no money was given to the petitioner by the complainant, and the same had been given to the co-accused. No specific role has been attributed to him. He is not beneficiary to the entire transaction. He did not hand over any fake visa/travel document to the complainant and has been implicated in this case only because of the fact that he is a relative of the co-accused. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. Accordingly, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. It is submitted that for conducting thorough and proper investigation in the manner, the custodial interrogation of petitioner is must. Even otherwise no extraordinary or exceptional circumstance for grant of benefit of bail has been made out in favour of the petitioner and with this broad submissions, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.



5. Rival contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

6. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have caused wrongful loss to the tune of Rs. 32,00,000/- to the complainant, as the complainant was induced to part with this much amount of money by the co-accused in connivance with the petitioner on the pretext of settling his family abroad. The petitioner has criminal antecedents since two more cases of similar nature have been registered against him. For conducting thorough investigation in the matter, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. It is also well settled that the Court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail and it should not be granted as a matter of rule and has to be granted only when the Court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extraordinary remedy. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

20th May, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*