

2025:PHHC:085946



217.

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

CRM-M-29159-2025

Date of decision: 15.07.2025

Surinder Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Harpreet Kaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Vikas Saroha, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.267, dated 01.11.2023, under Section 420 of IPC and Section 24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Sadhaura, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. It has been contended that the petitioner is engaged in the business of running a milk dairy and shares a familial relationship with the complainant. Still further, it has been submitted that the disputed question pertains to a monetary disagreement arising out of their dairy business dealings and not, as alleged, from any purported arrangement to facilitate the travel of the complainant's brother

abroad. Learned counsel submits that the present FIR is a result of a personal grudge and, therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is neither warranted nor necessary.

3. In compliance with the order dated 26.05.2025, reply by way of an affidavit dated 02.07.2025 of Harvinder Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar, on behalf of respondent-State, has already been filed in the Registry of this Court, which is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

4. *Vakalatnama* filed on behalf of respondent No.2 in Court today, is taken on record.

5. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for respondent No.2, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, has submitted that the allegations against the petitioner in the FIR, annexed as Annexure P-1, are grave and serious in nature. Furthermore, the petitioner, as per the learned State counsel, deceitfully obtained a sum of Rs.14 lakhs from the complainant under the pretext of arranging for the complainant's brother to travel to the USA. Out of the total amount received, a sum of Rs.2 lakhs was transferred through bank transactions. It has still further been submitted that the petitioner is already facing prosecution in another FIR involving similar allegations of cheating, thereby clearly indicating a pattern of conduct and reinforcing the apprehension that he is a habitual offender.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

7. At this stage, the allegations against the petitioner appear to be prima facie serious and substantial. The petitioner is alleged to have dishonestly induced the complainant to part with a large sum of money on a false assurance of securing a visa and arranging travel abroad for the brother of the complainant. The involvement of the petitioner in another criminal case involving similar allegations further compounds the gravity of the matter and raises significant concerns regarding his conduct.

8. This Court is, therefore, not inclined in view of the nature and seriousness of the allegations, the magnitude of the amount involved, and the petitioner's previous criminal antecedents, to extend the extraordinary concession of bail to him.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

10. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 15, 2025
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No