

2026:PHHC:055789



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

207

CRM-M No.10692 of 2026
Date of decision: 09.04.2026

Gagandeep Verma

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Manhav Malhotra, Advocate,
for Manit Malhotra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that due to some inadvertent typing mistake in the head note of the petition, it was typed that this is 1st petition for grant of anticipatory bail though infact it is the second petition. On his oral request, requisite correction in the head note of the petition is ordered to be made.

2. The instant one is the second petition as filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR

2026:PHHC:055789



No.115 dated 31.07.2025 registered under Sections 318(4) and 316(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) at Police Station Anandpur Sahib, District Rupnagar. His previous petition bearing CRM-M-53984-2025 had been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 20.11.2025.

3. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement submitted by the complainant Gurdarshan Chand alleging therein that his nephew Arpan Sud was doing IELTS course at Jhajj Immigration Consultancy and IELTS Centre operated at Village Jindwari, Nangal District Rupnagar. The accused Apaninder and his wife Amandeep Kaur who are running this consultancy services had told the nephew of the complainant that if someone was interested to go to France on work permit, they could arrange for the same. On receipt of this information, the complainant along with his cousin brother had met accused Apaninder and Amandeep Kaur, who initially represented that they could send his nephew to France on work as well as study visa but after sometime, they told that they could send him to UK. They also told the complainant that they themselves were going to UK for opening an office and would call his nephew to UK in sometime. By saying that they needed money for opening office as well as for sending his nephew there, they took an amount of Rs.4 lakhs from the family of the complainant.

2026:PHHC:055789



After reaching UK, they got transferred an amount of Rs.65,000/- through Google Pay in their account. Subsequently also, they made the complainant to part with a huge amount of money on the premise of getting certificate of service/visa issued in favour of his nephew. The present petitioner was projected as office manager of accused Apaninder and Amandeep Kaur and on their asking, money was given by the complainant to him as well. The accused Apaninder and Amandeep Kaur went to UK on the assurance that they would arrange for calling the nephew of the complainant there but returned. Neither any visa was got issued by them in favour of his nephew nor the money given to them was returned. By alleging that the present petitioner in connivance with the co-accused had cheated the complainant/his family and had caused wrongful loss of money to them, he prayed for taking action in the matter.

4. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which had been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rupnagar vide order dated 01.09.2025.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was merely an employee of Jhajj Immigration Consultancy. He had received money from the complainant

2026:PHHC:055789



at the instructions of co-accused Apaninder and Amandeep Kaur. He was not beneficiary of any transaction and has not derived any wrongful gain by himself. The principal role is attributed to the co-accused and not to him. The ingredients for commission of subject offences are not attracted qua him. He has been extended benefit of bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court in another case of similar nature registered against him as FIR No.116 of 2025 at Police Station Anandpur Sahib. He is not involved in any other case. He is ready to join investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. The co-accused have been arrested and have been extended benefit of regular bail. As such, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. Per contra, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab while relying upon the status report filed today has vehemently argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as in connivance with the co-accused, he had received an amount of Rs.3 lakhs and then Rs.13 lakhs respectively on 28.10.2024 and 21.11.2024 from the complainant, while claiming himself as office manager of Jhajj Immigration. For conducting thorough investigation and for recovery of the amount in question, his custodial interrogation is required. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

8. The petitioner is alleged to have received an amount of Rs.16

2026:PHHC:055789



lakhs from the complainant party on behalf of the co-accused who were running an immigration agency while projecting himself as office manager of the consultancy services rendered by the co-accused. The co-accused have since been arrested and extended benefit of bail. The fact that he was an employee under the co-accused had not been controverted. As such, it cannot be assumed that the money so received on behalf of the co-accused had been usurped by the present petitioner. Given the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner and the part attributed to him, this Court is of the considered opinion that pre trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. Considering the above, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail, subject to his surrendering before the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer within a period of ten days from the date of passing of this order and joining investigation. On his surrender within that period, he shall be released on bail by the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer on furnishing personal/surety bonds to his/her satisfaction. He shall also follow these conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall appear before the Investigating officer/Arresting officer as and when required during the course of investigation.
- (ii) He shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of

2026:PHHC:055789



the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

- (iii) He shall not commit any similar offence while on bail.
- (iv) He shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.
- (iv) He shall deposit his passport if any, with the jurisdictional Magistrate/trial Court.

9. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

10. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

09.04.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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