



**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh**

**Criminal Misc. No. M-49828 of 2025 (O&M)**

**Reserved On: 23.09.2025**  
**Pronounced On: 25.09.2025**

Mandeep Rana

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.**

Present: Mr. G.S.Ghuman, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Senior Deputy Advocate General,  
Punjab, for the respondent.

Mr. K.S.Dadwal, Advocate  
for the applicant/complainant.

**Surya Partap Singh, J.**

**CRM-38609-2025**

1. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is hereby allowed. Amended memorandum of parties is taken on record.

**CRM-M-49828-2025**

2. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 406, 409, 419,, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, the FIR No. 60 dated 11.05.2025, Police Station Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib, has been lodged, during the course of investigation, the petitioner has been arrested. He petitioner is in custody since 29.06.2025, and therefore, craving for the benefit of bail. This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of BNSS.

3. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from the record are that the FIR of this case came into being in response to a complaint submitted on complainant-Sukhwant Singh. It was alleged by the complainant that he had got opened an account in Post Office near Railway Station, and that he had been depositing money in the post office and purchasing Kisan Vikas Patras from time to time, through petitioner. According to complainant, the petitioner was having a close relationship with the employees of Post Office being Commission Agent, and that the entire record pertaining to account of complainant, including pass-book, were in possession of the petitioner. The complainant has further alleged that on various occasions he had asked for the above mentioned record, but the petitioner avoided on one pretext or another.

4. It was also alleged that for the purpose of dealing qua above said transactions, the petitioner used to visit complainant's house also and on many occasions he was accompanied with a lady whom he used to call mother. According to complainant, when he did not get any satisfactory reply from the petitioner, he made inquiries and found that the entire amount handed over by him for deposit in his account has been usurped by the petitioner. According to complainant, in order to usurp the money, handed over by the complainant, the petitioner mentioned his own mobile number in all the documents, and therefore, all the SMS etc. with regard to withdrawal of money were sent to the mobile phone of the petitioner and not the complainant. While alleging that he is 80 years old person suffering from brain tumor, the complainant sought action against the petitioner.

5. Heard.

6. It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent having no nexus, whatsoever, with the commission of crime, and that the fraud has been played by the officials of Postal Department but the petitioner has been made the scapegoat. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, it was not the job of the petitioner to collect money and deposit in the account being maintained in the Post Office, and therefore, the question of payment by the complainant to the petitioner does not arise at all. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that in fact, the money deposited by the complainant has been usurped by the dealing officials of the Postal Department and the entire fraud has been falsely attributed to the petitioner.

7. In addition to above, it has also been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that otherwise also, the petitioner has already suffered sufficient incarceration for being in custody for almost seven months, and that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate.

8. Per contra, the learned State counsel has argued that by twisting the facts, a wrong story has been projected by the petitioner, and that in fact, during the course of investigation, it has been found that the entire amount, which was withdrawn from the account of complainant, has been credited in the account of petitioner. According to learned State counsel, the instant case is not the isolated instance wherein the fraud has been played by the petitioner, with a depositor. As per learned State counsel, a large number of such persons, who were having trust in the petitioner, and paid him money for depositing in the Post Office, have been duped by the petitioner.

9. It has also been argued by learned State counsel that in order to meet liability qua other persons, the petitioner had gone to the extent that he issued cheques to them, but when the above said cheques were presented, those were dishonoured by the bank for want of requisite balance in the account. The learned State counsel has further submitted that other victims of the fraud of petitioner have already filed a number of complaints under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. The learned State counsel has highlighted the fact that the intention to cheat can be gauzed from the actions of the petitioner, who while depositing money in the name of complainant, mentioned his own mobile number so that any SMS with regard to transaction could not reach the complainant.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. A perusal of the record shows that in the present case, there are two relevant aspects which, if taken into consideration, falsify the story set out by the petitioner. In the present case, at the very outset, it is relevant to mention that there is no denial of the fact that the money deposited in the account of complainant has been usurped and in the above mentioned fraud, the accusing finger is pointing towards the petitioner, firstly because a large amount of unaccounted money came into his account, and secondly, in the account books pertaining to complainant, instead of mobile of the complainant, the mobile number of petitioner finds mentioned. Otherwise also, it is relevant to note that any motive has not been attributed to the complainant, who is 80 years old sick person, for false implication of the petitioner.

12. Taking into consideration all the above mentioned factors, it is

hereby held that at this stage, when the trial is in infant stage, the petitioner is not entitled for concession of bail, and the present petition, being devoid of merit, deserves dismissal. Thus, the present petition is hereby dismissed, accordingly.

**(Surya Partap Singh)**  
**Judge**

**September 25, 2025**  
**“DK”**

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