



253

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

CRM-M-39934-2025

Date of Decision:31.07.2025

MANDEEP ALIAS KALU

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Raman Sihag, Advocate &
Mr. Tejas Ahlawat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.79 dated 19.04.2023, registered under Sections 406, 420, 506 & 34 of IPC & Sections 10, 24 of Immigration Act, Police Station Alewa, District Jind.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had no concern or connection with the owner/representative of the Australian Overseas (Immigration Company) and had no financial transaction either with the complainant or with the said company. By referring to bank account detail (Annexure P-2), he contends that the petitioner had transferred a sum of more than Rs.16,00,000/- to the main accused and he himself is a victim in the present case. He next contends that it has been wrongly shown that an amount of Rs.5,000/- was recovered from him, whereas the currency notes recovered



from him did not carry any specific marks of identification and the recoveries were planted on him. Even during the course of investigation, the police could not collect any incriminating material against the present petitioner. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 19.05.2025 and all the offences in the present case are triable by the Court of Magistrate. He further submits that the petitioner is a first offender and was never involved in any other criminal activity.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. In the present case, it has been alleged that an amount of Rs.15,00,000/- was paid to the accused in the present case for sending the son of the complainant to USA. However, the prosecution is yet to lead evidence before the trial Court to prove the involvement of the petitioner in the crime. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

31.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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