

2025:PHHC:165626



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
211

CRM-M No.54617 of 2025
Date of decision: 27.11.2025

Baljeet Singh ... Petitioner
Vs.
State of Haryana and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

None for respondent No.2-complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
126	03.09.2025	Naggal, District Ambala, Haryana	316(2) and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by the complainant Joginder Singh alleging that the petitioner who was working as an immigration agent, had represented to

2025:PHHC:165626



him that he would send his son Pradeep Singh to Europe within a period of three months on spending an amount of Rs.16 lakhs. An agreement was executed between them in this regard. Thereafter, in October 2024, the petitioner told the complainant that he would send his son to Europe via Dubai and asked him to give a sum of Rs.2 lakhs for this purpose. On receipt of aforementioned amount of money, he called his son to Delhi on 08.01.2025 and after staying in Delhi for two days, sent him to Dubai. Thereafter, he sent copy of a visa and told the complainant that money was required for sending his son further to Europe. The complainant gave a sum of Rs.3,50,000/- in cash on 21.03.2025 and an amount of Rs.10,50,000/- on 26.03.2025. His son was made to stay in Dubai for five months but on assurance given by the petitioner that he would sent him to Europe before 10.04.2025, however, he would not sent anywhere else. The complainant was made to spend another amount of Rs.3 lakhs for bringing his son back from Dubai to India. The petitioner stopped having any contact with the complainant. By alleging that he had been cheated at the hands of the petitioner, the complainant prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala vide order dated 16.09.2025.

2025:PHHC:165626



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The complainant has previously filed a complaint on 21.07.2025 before the police. Inquiry was conducted and the said complaint was closed on 17.08.2025. By concealing this fact, another complaint was filed on 07.08.2025 on the basis of which this FIR has been falsely registered against the petitioner. This FIR is nothing more than an arm twisting device used by the complainant to extract money from him. Infact, a compromise was effected between the parties on 26.05.2025 which was signed by the complainant. Nothing remains due with the petitioner. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. The ingredients for commission of subject offences are not attracted against him. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre arrest bail.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He duped the complainant of a sum of Rs.16 lakhs on the premise of sending his son to Europe and usurped that amount for his own use. Settlement deed/compromise relied upon by the petitioner does not bear the signatures of the complainant and no money has been returned to him. There is no exceptional or extraordinary circumstance to grant benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. His custodial

2025:PHHC:165626



interrogation is required for effecting recovery as well as conducting proper and thorough investigation in the matter. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have cheated the complainant by extracting an amount of Rs.16 lakhs from him by representing that he would sent his son to Europe. After receipt of the said amount, the son of the complainant was neither sent to Europe nor his money has returned. The petitioner has placed on record Annexure P-3 which is stated to be a compromise arrived at between the complainant and the petitioner. However, the complainant has denied his signatures over the same. There are specific allegations against the petitioner. The case is at its nascent stage. For conducting proper and deeper probe into the matter, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. In case, the same is denied to the investigation agency, that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, adversely affecting the investigation. The custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order of anticipatory bail. The powers of anticipatory bail are extraordinary and the same are to be exercised sparingly in exceptional circumstances. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As

2025:PHHC:165626



such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

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

27.11.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No