



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

106

CRM-M-31277-2025

Date of decision: 2nd June, 2025

Parvinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Aniket Sindhar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Navreet Kaur Barnala, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. ADS Jattana, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 197 dated 29.04.2025 registered under Sections 420 of IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Zirakpur, SAS Nagar (Mohali).

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant Karanpreet Singh alleging that the petitioner Parvinder Singh, who was a travel agent, had induced him to part with a sum of Rs. 32,00,000/- on the pretext of sending him to UK. He had promised to return the money, if he was not able to arrange for a work permit and visa for the complainant. The money was taken from the complainant in cash as well as through bank transaction from the bank



account of the father of the complainant. In January 2024, the complainant was sent to UK on tourist visa but on reaching there, the petitioner proclaimed that the complainant had to take care of himself and did not provide work permit to him. He failed to fulfill the promise for providing a job to him. The work permit which was previously given to him by the co-accused Neeraj Kumar was also found to be fake. The complainant asked for return of money but was threatened by the petitioner and as such, he prayed for taking action against the petitioner. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail, which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar, vide order dated 26.03.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is not a travel agent by profession. He had only introduced the father of the complainant with the co-accused Neeraj Kumar, who was a travel agent and who had sent the brother of the petitioner abroad. No money had been given to the petitioner. He has no other role to play in the entire occurrence. The complainant had lodged two complainants previously, both of which had been filed after conducting inquiry. No case for commission of subject offences is made out against him. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. Hence, it is argued that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter.



6. At this stage, Mr. ADS Jattana, Advocate has filed power of attorney on behalf of the complainant. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, assisted by learned counsel for the Complainant, has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He, in connivance with the co-accused Neeraj, had induced the complainant to part with a huge amount of money. A fake work permit had been given to the complainant, which was found to be so on his reaching England. For conducting thorough investigation in the matter and for effecting recovery of money given by the complainant, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. No exceptional or extraordinary circumstance for grant of pre-arrest bail is made out. Hence, it is argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. Rival contentions raised by both the parties have been considered.

8. The petitioner, in connivance with the co-accused, is alleged to have cheated the complainant on the pretext of providing a work permit and visa for UK for him. The victim had been sent to UK, but as per the allegations, the work permit so given to him, was found to be fake. The complainant was compelled to come back to India. The allegations against the petitioner are specific and serious in nature. For conducting deeper probe and to elicit information about the manner in which the crime was committed, 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 extra ordinary 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.

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

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

2nd June, 2025

Parveen Sharma

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

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