



209

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

CRM-M-65445-2024**Date of Decision: 17.01.2025**

Jashanpreet Singh @ Waris Chouhan

...Petitioner

vs.

State of U.T. Chandigarh

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Roopak Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Kumar Goyal, APP. For U.T., Chandigarh.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.99 dated 06.09.2024, registered under Sections 120-B, 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC and Section 24 of Immigration Act, at Police Station North, Sector-3, Chandigarh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a young and educated boy, aged about 25 years. The petitioner applied for a job in a firm of Visa Support Services (VSS) and was selected as a Senior Team Leader and Counselor, which is proved from his appointment letter (Annexure P-1). He further contends that as per the GST Registration form (Annexure P-2), there were only two partners namely Satbir Singh and Vikramjeet Singh and the petitioner was only an employee in the said company. Later on, the petitioner was promoted as a Branch Manager and was issued an identity card



(Annexure P-3). Learned counsel further contends that the main accused Satbir Singh has already been arrested by the police and is in custody. He further contends that the only role assigned to the petitioner is that he had collected money on behalf of the firm VSS and no other role has been assigned to him. He further contends that the petitioner could never be termed as a beneficiary of the cheated amount and his custodial interrogation may not be required in the present case.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has wrongly positioned himself as a Branch Manager rather he has transferred a huge amount in his account. He further contends that even similar cases were ordered to be registered against the petitioner and the petition deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In the present case, at this stage, there is sufficient evidence to show that the petitioner was initially appointed as Senior Team Leader and Counselor by the main accused, which is evident from the appointment letter (Annexure P-1). Moreover, it can also be seen from his Identity card (Annexure P-3) that he was later on acting as a Branch Manager of VSS. Still further, even as per the registration certificate issued by Government of India, there were only two partners in the firm, namely Satbir Singh and Vikramjeet Singh. Thus, whether the petitioner had actively connived with his co-accused Satbir Singh or Vikramjeet Singh, while the crime was being committed, is a subject matter of adjudication before the trial Court. However, in the considered opinion of the

Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required in the present case.

6. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS

17.01.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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