



209

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-7492-2026
Decided on : 08.04.2026

Joga Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Hoshiar Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Vivek. K. Thakur, Advocate for
Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ramesh Sharma, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Joga Singh	03	04.01.2026	316(2), 318(4), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professional (Regulation) Act, 2014	Sultanpur Lodhi	Kapurthala

2. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, on 09.02.2026, following order was passed by this Court:-

“2. On oral request made by the petitioner, complainant namely Jagtar Singh son of Mehar Singh, resident of Village Jainpur, Tehsil Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2.



Let amended memo of parties be filed by counsel for the petitioner, within a period of two days from today, in the Registry, without moving any separate application.

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that as per the allegations, there are four accused in the present case, namely:- (i) Joga Singh, (ii) Jaswinder Kaur wife of Joga Singh, (iii) Pritam Singh, and (iv) Balvir Kaur wife of Pritam Singh.*

Complainant, Jagtar Singh, got the FIR registered alleging that an amount of Rs.44,15,000/- was misappropriated by the accused persons, who are his relatives and are stated to be working as agents for sending people abroad. It is alleged that in July 2024, the accused assured the complainant that he and his wife Jaswinder Kaur would be sent to America for a consideration of Rs.50 lacs. Despite complainant having paid a substantial amount of Rs.44,15,000/-, the accused allegedly harassed him for about four months, and thereafter, sent him to a camp in Mexico, where he was allegedly subjected to harassment for approximately seven months. Complainant is stated to have returned to India on 18.07.2025.

4. *Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in fact, police report was prepared against the petitioner on 19.12.2025, and pursuant thereto, FIR came to be registered on 04.01.2026.*

It is further contended that petitioner who is a permanent resident of the village, is running his own business, and owns 30 acres of agricultural land. In addition thereto, he has taken 20 acres of land on lease, thereby cultivating a total of 50 acres of land. An amount exceeding Rs.1 crore is lying deposited in his bank account as business turnover. Petitioner is thus financially stable, has deep roots in society, and there is no likelihood of his absconding or tampering with evidence. Thus, learned counsel prays for grant of the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. *Notice of motion.*

6. *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

7. *Adjourned to 12.03.2026.*

8. *Let newly added respondent No.2/complainant be served through the concerned SHO, for the next date of hearing.*

9. *Let a status report be filed by learned State counsel, specifically highlighting the credentials of the accused persons and inquiry*



conducted by the police officials in the present case.”

3. Today, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 07.04.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel refers to paragraph No.5 of the status report, which reads as under:-

“5. That during enquiry it transpired that on 05.09.2025, sum of Rs.8 lakh was received by petitioner and his wife from the complainant at Sultanpur Lodhi and on the same date, another sum of Rs.8 lakh was transferred in the bank account given by the petitioner. Copy of statement of account pertaining to the transfer of sum of Rs.8 lakhs is part of police record. Subsequently, sum of Rs.1 lakh is stated to have been given on 06.09.2024. Currency in dollars amounting to Rs.2,65,000/- was also taken by petitioner. Subsequently, sum of Rs.10 lakhs on 17.09.2024 and Rs.8 lakh on 20.09.2024 is stated to have been received by the petitioner. Further, sum of Rs.6,50,000/- were taken by the petitioner from Charan Singh son of Daup Singh, relative of complainant but despite repeated request, no amount was returned by the petitioner.”

5. As per the previous antecedents of the petitioner, there are two other cases registered against him, the details of which are as under:-

- “i. FIR No.285, dated 25.10.2025, under Sections 105, 3(5) of BNS, registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala (under investigation).*
- ii. FIR No.11, dated 23.02.2026, under Sections 303(2), 324(4), 3(5) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Talwandi Choudhrian, District Kapurthala (under investigation).”*

6. Learned State counsel while referring the appended bank statement(s) of complainant – Jagtar Singh, submits that Rs.8.00 lakhs, Rs.8.00 lakhs and Rs.3.00 lakhs, were transferred by the complainant, on



asking of the petitioner and one of the deposited amount belongs to the brother-in-law of the petitioner.

7. Heard.

8. From the status report filed by State, bank receipts of deposit of amount by the petitioner in the bank account(s) of the relative of the petitioner, have been noticed by this Court.

However, before proceeding further, on getting impression that this Court is not inclined with the submissions addressed by the petitioner's counsel, he seeks withdrawal of instant petition.

9. **Dismissed as withdrawn.**

However, concerned Investigating Officer is directed to proceed immediately for investigation, in accordance with law.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 08, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No