



102

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-26136-2025
Decided on : 16.09.2025

Ranjit Singh . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate and
Ms. Reetika Sabharwal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate and
Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ranjit Singh, Aged about 45 years	32	02.04.2025	420, 120-B of IPC, 1860	Sekhwan	Batala

2. As per the FIR, the allegation against the petitioner is that he, along with his sister – Davinder Kaur and other named accused, duped the complainant – Sarabjit Singh, of an amount of ₹22,22,500/- on the pretext of sending his son to the USA.

3. Petitioner is alleged to be a resident of the same village as the complainant. As per the allegations, it was the petitioner who introduced the



complainant to Sarabjit Singh, the main accused.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that an amount of ₹15,00,000/- was handed over to the petitioner on 02.03.2023. Thereafter, neither the said amount was returned to the complainant, nor his son was sent abroad.

5. On the previous dates of hearing, several opportunities were afforded to the petitioner to amicably settle the dispute with the complainant. However, today, learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, submits that nothing is payable by the petitioner to the complainant. Therefore, monetary dispute cannot be resolved.

6. Be that as it may, looking at the allegation that the petitioner has received an amount of ₹15,00,000/- from the complainant, as specifically mentioned in the FIR, and keeping in view the fact that such like offences are on the rise in this part of the Country (State of Punjab), this Court does not find any substantial reason to extend the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Petitioner stands **dismissed** accordingly.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 16, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No