



264

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

CRM-M-10192-2026

Date of Decision:- 30.04.2026

KHUSHDEEP KAUR

....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner Khushdeep Kaur has filed instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.69 dated 08.06.2024 under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC, 1860 and Section 24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Phase-11, District SAS Nagar (Mohali) (Annexure P-1).

2. As per facts of the case, Ram Pal Mandal filed written complaint alleging that he had approached Skyline Service Point, SCO No.45, Top Floor, Phase-11, Sector-65, Mohali for sending his son and relative abroad. As per agreement, it was decided that entire payment would be made after issuance of visa, Pardeep Kumar was working with him as an Agent. They paid Rs.72 lacs to them partly in cash and partly through bank transactions. He visited their office and it was found to be locked and their mobile phone numbers were switched off. Passports and




other documents were also in their possession. Said Khushdeep Kaur was proprietor of Skyline Service Point. Various amounts were transferred as detailed in the FIR. In this way, they are cheated for huge amount of approximately Rs.72 lacs. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that allegations levelled against him are false and without any basis. In-fact, she is the victim. She wanted to go abroad on study visa. Her husband Gurjeet Singh had approached Kamal Rashpal Singh @ Jatin who represented to be in the business of travel agent. She was falsely trapped and in this regard she filed a complaint against Kamal Rashpal Singh, Amandeep and Jashandeep Singh (Annexure P-2). Without considering the aforesaid factual position, his anticipatory bail application was wrongly declined by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mohali vide order dated 30.01.2026 (Annexure P-4). She is ready to join the investigation.

4. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed. Inquiry was conducted by DSP (Traffic), SAS Nagar. During inquiry, it was found that present petitioner Khushdeep Kaur was running Skyline Service Point at Mohali. She received huge amount for sending the family of complainant abroad and after proper inquiry, present FIR was registered.

Learned counsel representing State further pointed out that present petitioner is involved in several other cases of similar nature i.e. FIR No.68 dated 08.06.2024 under Sections 406 and 420 IPC and Section 24 of Immigration Act, Police Station Phase-11, SAS Nagar, Mohali and FIR No.54 dated 17.05.2024 under Sections 406 and 420 IPC and Section



24 of Immigration Act, Phase-11, SAS Nagar, Mohali. In the said cases huge amounts are involved. Stand taken by the petitioner is after thought.

5. I have considered the arguments. Present petitioner Khushdeep Kaur is specifically named in the present FIR. As referred above, huge amount is involved i.e. approximately Rs.72 lacs allegedly received by her for sending the family of complainant abroad. Apart from this, she is involved in two other cases, as referred above, with similar allegations. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioner is required to join the investigation. In light of this, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the same is, accordingly, declined.

6. Pending misc. application, if any, stands disposed of.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

30.04.2026

snd

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