



CRM-M-45857-2025

1

213 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-45857-2025

Date of Decision: 27.10.2025

DEEPAK KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. B.S. Randhawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab
assisted by ASI Jaswinder Singh.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.60, dated 26.04.2025, registered at Police Station Satnampura, District Kapurthala (Annexure P-1), under Sections 420 and 406 of IPC, 1860 and Section 13 of Punjab Travels Professional Regulation Act, 2014.

2. Status report by way of affidavit dated 26.10.2025 of Bharat Bhushan, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Phagwara, Kapurthala filed on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record.

Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. On 22.08.2025, the following order was passed:-

"1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.60, dated 26.04.2025, registered at Police Station Satnampura, District Kapurthala (Annexure P-1), under Sections 420 and 406 of IPC, 1860 and Section 13 of Punjab Travels Professional Regulation Act, 2014.

2. Notice of motion.

3. Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab accepts notice on



behalf of the respondent-State. Both the parties have been heard and material on file has been perused.

4. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Harpreet Kaur with the allegations that Deepak Kumar had taken a sum of Rs.7,90,000/- from them to send her brother Gagan to New Zealand on work permit. Deepak and his maternal uncle Harjinder had introduced them to one Pankaj and out of the total amount of Rs.7,90,000/-, some amount was deposited in the account of Pankaj and some amount was deposited in the account of Harjinder while one lakh is stated to have been given in cash to petitioner-Deepak Kumar and Rs.40,000/- was deposited in the account of Kuldeep Enterprises who is a relative of Harjinder. However, no work permit or Visa was arranged and accused have also refused to return the money.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner is a mechanic and he does not deal in arranging work Visa for sending anyone abroad. False allegations have been levelled that a sum of Rs.1 lakh was paid in cash to him and infact, the entire amount has been deposited in the accounts of Harjinder and Pankaj and a sum of Rs.40,000/- was deposited in the account of Kuldeep Enterprises with whom petitioner has no concern. Learned counsel further contended that a compromise was effected between the complainant and Pankaj Kumar wherein Pankaj Kumar had agreed to return the entire amount and liability was that of Pankaj Kumar. The compromise was also signed by the petitioner as a witness as well as Harjinder and Pankaj Kumar and the complainant. Learned counsel next contended that petitioner has been implicated only to pressurize him to pay the amount as Harjinder accused is his maternal uncle. Learned counsel contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.



6. *On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that a sum of Rs.1 lakh was paid in cash to petitioner and all the accused in conspiracy with each other have cheated the complainant of a sum of Rs.7,90,000/-. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to find out the truth and the manner in which offence was committed and he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.*

7. *Adjourned to 27.10.2025 for filing status report. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS/438(2) Cr.P.C.”*

4. Today, on instructions from ASI Jaswinder Singh, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 22.08.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 22.08.2025, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

6. Disposed of.

7. Pending misc application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

27.10.2025

Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No