



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

210

CRM-M-22988-2025

Date of decision : 23.09.2025

GURPREET KHAN

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

..... RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Arhdeep Singh Virdi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mikhail Kad, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH. J.(Oral)

1. This is a petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS'), for anticipatory bail, in a case arising out of FIR No.36 dated 06.04.2025 under Sections 318(4) of BNS 2023, Police Station Cheema Police District Sangrur.

2. In nut-shell the allegations as contained in the FIR are that on the pretext of procuring visa for the daughter of complainant, a deal was struck between the complainant and a travel agent, namely Wonder Stone, through petitioner. According to complainant a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- was paid for the above mentioned purpose but the Visa was not procured.

3. Heard.

4. A perusal of record shows that reply has already been filed by learned State counsel.

5. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that in fact the agency was supposed to procure Visa and the only allegation against the petitioner is that he was a middle man, whereas the deal was between the complainant and the above mentioned Agency. According to learned counsel for the petitioner as per allegations, a sum of Rs. 1,60,000/- has to be returned by the petitioner and out of above mentioned amount of Rs. 1,60,000/-, Rs. 1,10,000/- has already been paid to the complainant. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the Visa had been procured for the daughter of complainant, but that daughter of complainant on her own refused to go abroad.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent No.3 has argued that in the present case there are allegations of fraud played by the petitioner which are serious in nature, and that out of Rs.1,60,000/-, only Rs.1,10,000/- have been paid.

7. In addition to above, it has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that despite the fact that petitioner has joined investigation, the documents of the daughter of complainant, such as passport, school certificates have not been returned.

8. With regard to above mentioned arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the above mentioned documents are lying with the agency and not with the petitioner.

9. In view of above mentioned rival contentions of the parties, following are the points which needs to be taken into consideration:-

- (a) that the offence is triable by Court of Magistrate;
- (b) that out of Rs.1,60,000/-, Rs.1,10,000/- have already been returned by the petitioner to the complainant;
- (c) that the petitioner has already joined the investigation.

10 In view of above, the order dated 01.05.2025 is hereby made absolute. The present petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

23.09.2025

vipin

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether Reportable	:	No