



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

242

CRM-M-52536-2025

Date of decision: 19th November, 2025

Sukhpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Supneep Singal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The petitioner herein is seeking indulgence of this Court by filing this petition for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 03 dated 11.01.2020 registered under Sections 420, 464, 468, 471 of IPC (Section 201 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Sadar Faridkot, District Faridkot on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant Sahib Singh alleging that the petitioner had induced him to part with a sum of Rs. 10,00,000/- on the premise of getting issued a multiple entry visa for Canada in his favour but had given him a fake and fabricated document claiming it to be a visa issued in his favour and thereby cheated him.

2. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was declared a proclaimed person vide order dated 18.11.2021. He was apprehended on 11.01.2025 and is in custody since then. Investigation now stands completed. Previous petition as filed by the petitioner had been dismissed by this Court on 11.07.2025.



3. This second petition has been filed by the petitioner on the ground that investigation has since been completed. Challan has been presented. He is not required to be kept in custody for further investigation. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. A compromise has been arrived at between the parties and the entire disputed amount of money has been given by him to the complainant. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. The father of the complainant has been examined and has turned hostile. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that there is no new or substantive change in the circumstances from the date of dismissal of his previous petition and it is, therefore, urged that the petition is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant has, however, affirmed the fact that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and is also stated that the complainant has no objection the petition is allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is in custody since 15.01.2025. His previous petition was dismissed vide order dated 11.07.2025. It is well settled proposition of law that every day spent in custody can provide a new cause of action for filing a bail petition in certain circumstances. An accused cannot be kept in custody for an indefinite period of time. A bail petition can be considered on its own merits even if it is filed repeatedly. It is also well



settled that the fresh grounds which persuade to a Court to take a view different from the one taken in the earlier petition are also required to be recorded while entertaining a successive bail application. Reference in this regard can be made to ***Prasad Srikant Purohit vs. State of Maharashtra (2018) 11 SCC 458*** wherein it was observed so. In the considered opinion of this Court, the recording of statement by the father of the complainant thereby resiling from the previous version amounts to change in circumstances. A written compromise shown to be executed between him and the complainant and the petitioner has also placed on record as Annexure P-2. Though no conclusion as to the genuineness of this Court can be drawn by this Court at this stage, nor much relevance can be given to the same, however, keeping in view the period spent by the petitioner in custody, nature of the allegations as well as the nature of the evidence which has come on record, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case for release of the petitioner is on bail is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

19th November, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*