

CRM-M-34182-2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34182-2024
Reserved on: 09.07.2025
Pronounced on: 29.07.2025

Aditi Goel ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Keshavam Chaudhary, Advocate and
Ms. Hargun Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Naseem A. Sheikh, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
89	26.04.2024	Navi Baradari, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar	406/420 IPC

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC, seeking regular bail.

2. Per the custody certificate dated 08.07.2025, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	122	22.06.2024	406/420/120B IPC	City Khanna 2
2	130	31.07.2024	420 IPC	Canal Colony
3	375	09.11.2024	420/120B IPC and 13 of Punjab Travel	City Kharar

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply dated 26.11.2024, filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“That the complainant/applicant stated in her complaint that the complainant is a licensed immigration services provider in Punjab, had business dealings with Ajay Chopra of Map My Application, Jalandhar, for Canada study visas. Ajay Chopra introduced the complainant to Aditi Goel (present petitioner) and her family, including her mother Urvashi,

CRM-M-34182-2024

brother Bakul Raj, and sister Ameesha. Aditi Goel by presenting herself as connections with someone in UK, assured the complainant that she could procure legitimate Certificates of Sponsorship (COS) required for skilled candidates seeking visas for the UK.

The complainant further stated that trusting the assurances given by the above-said persons, the complainant entered into an agreement with Aditi Goel (present petitioner), who promised to deliver the COS within 72 hours for a fee of Rs 14,500 per client. The complainant transferred substantial amounts to various bank accounts of Aditi Goel and her family members' bank accounts for various clients. Additionally, further payments were made for visa applications, health surcharges, and related costs. Despite assurances, the Certificate of Sponsorship (hereinafter referred to as COS) provided by Aditi Goel turned out to be fake. The visa applications of the complainant's clients were rejected, and some of the applicants, along with their families, were banned from entering the UK for ten years.

The complainant further stated that upon confronting AditiGoel and her family, they admitted their wrongdoing and issued a notarized affidavit, promising to refund the complainant and rectify the situation by a specified date. The above-said persons caused financial losses to the tune of approximately Rs 1.5 crores and irreparable damage to the complainant's business and the future of the clients of the complainant.

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family. Counsel further submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

5. The State's counsel as well as counsel for the complainant oppose the bail and refers to the reply.

REASONING:

6. Perusal of para 15 of the reply dated 26.11.2024 reflects that no amount was transferred in the account of petitioner, whatever attributed to petitioner was in cash, which create doubt and make petitioner's case for bail. There is sufficient prima facie

CRM-M-34182-2024

evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. Per the custody certificate dated 08.07.2025 the petitioner’s total custody in this FIR is 01 year & 24 days. Given the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, petitioner is a woman and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

7. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

8. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

9. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

10. This order is subject to the petitioner’s complying with the following terms.

11. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case, or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

12. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner’s behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

13. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the

CRM-M-34182-2024

authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

14. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

15. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

16. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

29.07.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.