2025:PHHC:159926

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-63812-2025
Date of decision: 18.11.2025

AMANDEEP SINGH DEOL ......Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA ....Respondent

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

*****

Present: - Ms. Komal Bidhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana
for the respondent-State.

*****

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 50 dated 03.03.2024, registered under Section(s) 406, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Hansi Sadar, District Hisar.

2. Briefly stated, the allegations in the present case arise from FIR No. 50 dated 03.03.2024 registered at Police Station Sadar Hansi, District Hisar, on the complaint of Rajender Kumar, resident of Village Masoodpur, Tehsil Hansi, District Hisar. The complainant alleged that he and his brother, Rajesh, were cheated on the pretext of being sent abroad for employment. According to the complainant, one Naresh Kumar, son of Giani of Village

Kinnar and a relative of the complainant, introduced them to Hardeep Singh, resident of Village Dharodi, District Jind. Hardeep Singh allegedly represented himself as a person engaged in arranging foreign employment visas, particularly for Australia. Naresh Kumar further assured the complainant that Hardeep Singh had earlier facilitated the travel of several individuals and that he was trustworthy. Believing these representations, the complainant and his brother handed over their documents to Hardeep Singh, who promised to procure visas within 20–25 days. Hardeep Singh thereafter sent certain documents purporting to be visas and demanded a total payment of ₹43 lakhs. Out of this amount, ₹23 lakhs were paid through bank transfers and ₹20 lakhs in cash at the residence of Hardeep Singh, in the presence of his wife, Sharda Kumari, and father, Shamsher Singh. The bank transfers were made to accounts allegedly belonging to associates of Hardeep Singh—₹10 lakhs to Amandeep Singh Deol, ₹5 lakhs to Sonu of Village Jheel, and ₹5 lakhs and ₹2.5 lakhs, through a friend, to one Jasdev Chahil by maternal uncle of the complainant. Additionally, ₹50,000 was transferred via Google Pay to Sharda Kumari, wife of Hardeep Singh. After receiving these payments, Hardeep Singh provided air tickets which were later found to be forged. He repeatedly postponed the promised travel and ultimately sent Rajesh to Bangkok on 22.05.2023, assuring him of a connecting flight to Melbourne. Rajesh, however, remained stranded for several days in Bangkok as no further arrangements were made. Realising the fraudulent nature of the entire transaction, he returned to India. When the complainant confronted Hardeep Singh and his associates, they neither refunded the money nor offered any explanation and allegedly issued threats. A panchayat convened thereafter also yielded no resolution or repayment. The complainant thereafter approached the police, alleging a well-planned conspiracy involving Hardeep Singh, his wife Sharda Kumari, his father Shamsher Singh, Naresh Kumar, Amandeep Singh Deol, Sonu, and Jasdev Chahil, alleging that they collectively cheated him of ₹46 lakhs. On these allegations, the aforesaid FIR was registered under Sections 406, 420, and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, pertaining to criminal breach of trust, cheating, and criminal conspiracy in connection with the visa fraud scheme.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner had no contact or connection with any of the accused persons, and that the only allegation levelled against him is that an amount of ₹10 lakhs was transferred into his account by the main accused. It is contended that the petitioner has been in custody since 20.02.2025 and has undergone only about ten months of actual incarceration. No further recovery is to be effected from him. Counsel further submits that three co-accused namely Naresh, Jasdev Chahil & Sharda Kumari have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this court vide order dated 14.06.2024 passed in CRM-M-29985-2024, order dated 26.03.2025 passed in CRM-M-12948-2025 and order dated 12.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-25583-2025 respectively. It is also argued that the present case is triable by a Magistrate and, despite the prosecution citing as many as twenty witnesses, not even a single witness has been examined till date.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-State, however, submits that the petitioner is also an accused in another similar case registered at Bathinda and, therefore, cannot be said to be without criminal antecedents. She

nonetheless does not dispute that the petitioner has undergone nearly ten months of actual custody and that the trial has not yet commenced.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. In view of the facts noticed above, and taking into consideration the nature of the allegations, the stage of the trial, the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the fact that the case is triable by a Magistrate, and further noting that the co-accused have already been granted bail, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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

9. 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

NOVEMBER 18, 2025
Vishal Sharma

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