



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

224

**CRM-M-33328-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.07.2025**

Karanveer @ Karan Arora

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present:- Mr. N.S. Swaitch, Advocate and
Ms. Harshmir Kaur Swaitch, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J.(Oral)

The present petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. has been filed for setting aside the order dated 06.06.2025 (annexure P-3) passed by learned chief Judicial Magistrate, Bathinda in interim application No.1 of 2025 (Annexure P-2) in case bearing No.UCR No.49 of 2025 titled as '**State v. Sheenu Arora & Others**', whereby the application moved by the petitioner seeking permission to travel abroad, specifically to Canada, has been rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner requests that the petitioner may be granted permission to travel to Canada for a period of five months in order to enable him to discharge his personal and familial obligations, particularly to attend to his spouse, who is undergoing urgent medical treatment (Annexure P-8), and to take care of his minor daughter, aged 1.5 years, who requires constant care and attention in view of the prevailing health condition of the petitioner's wife. It is also prayed that the presence of the petitioner at Canada for a minimum period of five months is imperative for him to retain his residency status at Canada, as per



legal requirements under Canadian Immigration laws, rules and regulations. It is further submitted that even the investigation agency has submitted a cancellation report before the trial Court, which is pending consideration and petitioner is positive that the same would be accepted, given the vague nature of allegations so levelled against him, which make a clear case of false implication. A bare perusal of the FIR reveals that only the name of the petitioner has been mentioned therein, without specifying any role which the petitioner played in the alleged suicide of the deceased. It is further submitted that to show his bona fide, the petitioner on affidavit has submitted that he is also ready and willing to deposit two fixed deposits made in his name worth approximately Rs.6 lacs as personal surety. Further, even the mother of the petitioner has on affidavit stated that she undertakes to take full responsibility and ensure the presence of the petitioner before this Court or the learned Trial Court as and when directed or required; and that she is willing to give as surety of a property in her name situated in district Muktsar Sahib, estimated worth of which is Rs.1.5 crores. Reliance has been placed upon the decision passed by this Court in **CRM-M-3304-2021** titled as '*Amit Sureshmal Lodha vs. State of Haryana*'.

3. Learned State counsel while relying upon the contents of the status report dated 09.07.2025 submits that upon thorough inquiry conducted by the Special Investigation Team, it was found that the petitioner did not abet the mother of the complainant to consume any poisonous substance. It is thereafter that a cancellation report was prepared and thereafter submitted before the learned Trial Court on 03.08.2024 for consideration.

4. Heard.

5. The petitioner has raised debatable points with respect to his involvement in the FIR, in which cancellation report has already been prepared by



the investigating agency and is pending consideration before the learned Trial Court. The petitioner has raised earnest pleas qua the exigencies which require his presence abroad, and has undertaken to abide by all the considerations which would be imposed upon him by this Court. The mother of the petitioner, who is residing in India, on affidavit has stated that she takes full responsibility for the presence of the petitioner before this court or the learned Trial Court as the case may be, whenever he is required.

6. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 06.06.2025 is set aside. The petitioner is permitted to go to Canada for a period of three months starting from 19.07.2025 to 19.10.2025 subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall furnish two sureties (one being of his mother Janak Dulari to the tune of Rs.6 lacs each) to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate for ensuring his return from abroad and appearance before the Court.
- (ii) In addition to the aforesaid sureties, the mother of the petitioner, Janak Dulari shall also give as surety the immovable property in her ownership and possession i.e. Plot No.365, measuring 240 sq. yards at Green Field Enclave, PUDA Colony, Malout, District Muktsar Sahib.
- (iii) After the acceptance of the said sureties, the petitioner would be permitted to go abroad from 19.07.2025 to 19.10.2025 subject to the condition that the petitioner would have to come back to India immediately on the lapse of the said period. The concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate shall permit the



petitioner to go abroad for the said period in case, the sureties so given are to the satisfaction of the concerned Magistrate/trial Court.

- iv) The petitioner shall give an undertaking before the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate that the petitioner shall return from abroad on the date so specified and appear before the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate for the purpose of trial and would not seek any extension with respect to the same.
- v) A similar undertaking would be made by the mother of the petitioner Janak Dulari to the effect that she undertakes full responsibility to ensure the return of the petitioner to India within the specified time limit.
- vi) Upon the acceptance of the sureties and also upon giving the undertaking, as directed aforesaid and after specifying the date of return in the aforesaid manner, the passport of the petitioner shall be released to him and he would be permitted to go abroad.
- vii) During the period of the petitioner being abroad, the personal appearance of the petitioner shall be exempted and the petitioner shall be permitted to appear through his counsel. However, the petitioner would not be entitled to raise the objection that the evidence had been led in his absence.
- viii) The petitioner shall not dispute his identity.
- ix) The petitioner shall not in any manner tamper with the evidence of the prosecution.



- x) The petitioner shall not visit any other country except Canada, during the said period for which the permission to travel abroad has been granted by this Court.
- xi) The petitioner on returning, within five days from the date of return, shall produce his passport before the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.
- xii) On return, the petitioner shall continue to be bound by the old/previous conditions which were imposed while releasing the petitioner on bail and the conditions imposed for his going abroad, as have been detailed in this order, shall cease to operate.
- xiii) Any other condition which the learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of in the above said terms.

8. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

11.07.2025
Kapil

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