



CRM-M-52126-2025

1

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

105

CRM-M-52126-2025

Decided on :17.11.2025

Barinderpal Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Shakti Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 0127 dated 25.04.2025, registered under Sections 318(4) and 61(2) of the BNS and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Civil Lines, Batala, District Batala, Punjab.

2. Allegations in the FIR disclose that petitioner has cheated complainant-Vikram Singh, of a total sum of ₹49,00,000/- on the pretext of sending his son and nephew to Australia. It is alleged that an amount of ₹29,53,200/- was transferred directly into the petitioner's bank account, in addition to ₹9,25,000/- allegedly paid to him in cash. Despite repeated demands, neither were the promised travel arrangements made nor was the amount returned to the complainant.

3. On the previous date of hearing, i.e., 17.09.2025, this Court granted an opportunity to the petitioner to reflect upon the matter and to

**CRM-M-52126-2025****2**

indicate whether he was willing to reimburse the cheated amount, at least as a gesture of bona fides. However, today, instead of giving a clear response on this aspect, learned counsel for the petitioner has chosen to argue the matter purely on merits, without showing any inclination to make restitution.

4. This Court cannot lose sight of the fact that cases of cheating under the guise of facilitating foreign travel are alarmingly on the rise in the State. Allegations in the present case are serious and supported by prima facie documentary evidence showing direct deposits into the petitioner's bank account, apart from the cash payments.

5. In the totality of circumstances, and keeping in view the nature and gravity of the accusations, the modus operandi attributed to petitioner, the stage of investigation, and the absence of any bona fide conduct on his part, this Court is not inclined to invoke its extraordinary jurisdiction under Section 482 of the BNSS to grant the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, finding no merit in present petition, same is hereby dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

17.11.2025*Rashmi*

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*