



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

218

CRM-M-50626-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 15.09.2025

Harbhajan Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sudhir Rana, Advocate;
Mr. Virender Ahlawat, Advocate;
Mr. Ankush Duhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR bearing No.731 dated 03.12.2024, registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, 1983 at Police Station Indri, District Karnal.

2. Briefly summarised, the case of the prosecution rests on a complaint lodged by Dinesh Kumar S/o Raghbir Singh, alleging that accused persons, namely (i) Sandeep Kumar, (ii) Channi, (iii) Balwinder Singh, (iv) Harbhajan Singh, and (v) Raman Dawar, fraudulently extorted a sum of ₹20,65,000/- from him by promising to arrange his travel abroad through fake visas. The complainant, aspiring to settle in the United States, approached accused Nos.1 and 2 in January 2024, who assured him of



facilitating his migration for a consideration of ₹40 lakhs. Acting on their inducement, he initially paid ₹1 lakh and later handed over 2500 USD at Chandigarh Airport to accused Nos.3 and 4, who arranged his travel from Chandigarh to Mumbai. From there, he was sent to Dubai, kept for about a month, and then to Uzbekistan for 15 days, where he bore his own expenses, yet no onward travel to Mexico materialised. Upon being called back to Delhi in March 2024, the accused kept shifting him between Delhi and Mumbai, all the while extracting assurances and further payments. Eventually, they demanded ₹17 lakhs more for sending him to Suriname as a transit to Mexico. Trusting them, the complainant, through his friend Ravinder Sharma, deposited ₹17 lakhs with accused No.5, who even executed a written statement acknowledging the same. Despite this, the complainant was never sent abroad. Instead, a fake visa of Egypt was provided, which prevented him from boarding the flight. Thereafter, the accused evaded him, refused to refund the money, and even extended threats to his life when he sought repayment. It is thus alleged that right from the inception, the accused harboured a fraudulent intention to cheat the complainant, deceitfully obtained a total of ₹20,65,000/- from him, and thereafter refused either to perform their assurance or to refund the money. On the basis of the said allegations, the FIR was registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as per the prosecution's own case, an amount of ₹17 lakhs was paid by the complainant to the accused persons. Out of this, ₹5 lakhs was retained by co-accused Raman Dawar, ₹3 lakhs was received by co-accused Balwinder



Singh, and a further sum of ₹4 lakhs is alleged to have been received by the present petitioner from the ₹9 lakhs transferred to Maninder Singh. It is further submitted that a recovery of ₹2,05,000/- has already been effected from the petitioner. It is argued that the petitioner has been in custody since 24.05.2025, while co-accused Raman Dawar and Balwinder Singh, who stand on an identical footing, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal, vide orders dated 24.07.2025 and 20.05.2025 respectively. It is further contended that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and that the trial has not yet commenced.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid aspects.

5. Considering that the investigation in the present case is already complete, the petitioner is not involved in any other case and evidence has so far not commenced and similarly placed co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to him furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or



indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

15.09.2025
Mangal Singh

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