



101

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

**CRM-M-65492-2024 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 18.11.2025**

NARINDER SINGH AND ANR**.....PETITIONERS****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER****.....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. C.S. Jattana, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gurbir Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)**CRM-46454-2025**

1. Present application has been moved by the applicants/petitioners for placing on record the documents dated 03.02.2024, 03.02.2024, 11.04.2024 and 07.05.2025, respectively, as Annexures P-4 to P-7.

2. Notice in the application.

3. Mr. Gurbir Singh Sidhu, Advocate, puts an appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2/complainant, and raises no serious objection, if prayer made in the present application, is allowed.

4. Considering the averments mentioned in the application, prayer made in the application is allowed and documents dated 03.02.2024, 03.02.2024, 11.04.2024 and 07.05.2025, respectively, are ordered to be taken on record as Annexures P-4 to P-7. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

5. CM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-65492-2024

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioners, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.169, dated 01.12.2024, under Sections 420/34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Bathinda.

2. Broadly, allegations levelled by the complainant Gurjit Singh are that petitioners are parents of Harmandeep Kaur, who had cleared the IELTS examination. Complainant's son married her on the promise that both would later settle in Canada. For arranging the marriage and facilitating her education, complainant claims to have spent an amount of Rs. 38 lacs. However, after marriage, when Harmandeep Kaur settled in Canada, her family members allegedly backed out of their promise.

3. Considering these allegations, while issuing notice to the respondents on 09.01.2025, dispute was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, and arrest of the petitioners was stayed.

4. Although mediation proceedings failed, interim order is continuing, till date.

5. Primary argument put forth by counsel for the petitioners is that not a single penny has been credited to the bank account of the petitioners. Therefore, *prima facie*, the offence of cheating cannot be made out against them. It is argued that except of bald allegation, there is no other supporting evidence. Moreover, petitioners expresses their willingness to join the investigation and fully cooperate, provided they are protected from arrest. Thus, counsel seeks grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the present case.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel as well as counsel for respondent No.2 vehemently oppose the present petition, by submitting that petitioners' intention can be inferred from their conduct, as despite the marriage between complainant's son and petitioners' daughter, she has not made any proper arrangement to enable the complainant's son to join her in Canada.

7. Considering the relationship between the parties and nature of the allegations, and noticing that counsel for respondent No.2/complainant is unable to show that any amount was paid by the complainant to the petitioners, this Court finds no reason to keep the present petition pending.

8. **Therefore, present petition is allowed**, by directing the petitioners to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioners would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

9. Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.

10. With the directions passed here above, present petition stands disposed of.

18.11.2025

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>