



CRM-M-5283-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-5283-2026

Date of decision: 05.02.2026

VARINDER SINGH**...PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****...RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: G.S.Minhas, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ekam Pal Sagoo, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.206, dated 16.10.2022, under Section 406, 420, 120-B IPC and Section 13 Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulations) Act, registered at Police Station City Phagwara, Kapurthala.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case is that the FIR was lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Harbans Lal. It was alleged that he is aged about 80 years, was introduced by Pappu of village Mansurpur to Smt. Manjit Kaur, wife of Sukhwinder Singh, who represented that she make arrangements for you to travel to Italy. The complainant and several other persons handed over their passports and documents to Manjit Kaur. She demanded ₹6,00,000 per person and collected ₹50,000 per person in advance. Accordingly, all persons transferred ₹50,000 each into the bank accounts of Manjit Kaur and her daughter Amritpal Kaur maintained at Capital Small Finance Bank and State Bank of India. Thereafter, an additional ₹25,000 per person was received in cash and through bank transfers. In total, the accused persons received approximately ₹65

**CRM-M-5283-2026****-2-**

lakhs from the complainant. Subsequently, the accused persons avoided the complainant and absconded from their residences. No person was sent abroad and no amount was refunded. The request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. On framing of charges, trial commenced. He approached the learned Sessions Judge, Kapurthala for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned learned Sessions Judge, Kapurthala declined the bail application vide order dated 09.01.2025. The petitioner has earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-8765-2025 and the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 30.04.2025. Thereafter, petitioner filed CRM-M-35233-2025 and CRM-M-52032-2025 and the same were dismissed vide orders dated 11.07.2025 and 19.09.2025, respectively. Thus, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the fourth petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that there were total 04 accused in the present case. He further submits that the alleged transaction of ₹6,40,0000/- was in the account of the co-accused, namely, Manjit Kaur and Amritpal Kaur @ Amrit Kaur who are the wife and mother-in-law of the petitioner. He further submits that both of the co-accused have already been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide orders dated 04.10.2023 and 27.05.2024 passed in CRM-M-24419-2023 and CRM-M-7170-2024, respectively as Annexures P-2 and P-3. He further submits that there is no allegation of any transaction having been made in the account of the petitioner. Therefore, the case of the petitioner stands on a better footing than that of the co-accused. He further submits that petitioner is behind bars since 23.11.2024 and he

**CRM-M-5283-2026****-3-**

submits that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner and submits that an amount of ₹65,00,000/- was deposited by the complainant and others into the bank account of the petitioner and the co-accused, hence, the complicity of the petitioner is duly established during investigation. He, on instructions, submits out of total 37 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that though the petitioner was arrested on 23.11.2024. The co-accused, namely, Manjit Kaur and Amritpal Kaur @ Amrit Kaur have already been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year, 02 months and 10 days as on 04.02.2026 and he is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in that case. Out of total 37 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be



CRM-M-5283-2026

-4-

concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

05.02.2026
renubala

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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