



CRM-M-14893-20261

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

219CRM-M-14893-2026

Decided on :20.05.2026

Rubina. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Navjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

-.-
SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present Second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS (corresponding to Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail in FIR No. 882 dated 20.11.2024, under Sections 406, 420, and 506 of the IPC (corresponding to Sections 316, 318, and 351 of the BNS), as well as Section 24 of the Immigration Act. Subsequently, Sections 467, 468, and 471 IPC were also added (corresponding to Sections 338, 340(2), and 340 of the BNS), registered at Police Station Sadar Karnal, District Karnal.
2. First bail petition, i.e., CRM-M-39081-2025 filed by the petitioner, was disposed of vide order dated 24.02.2026 with liberty to file a fresh petition upon furnishing complete details of the nine other cases. Hence, the present is the second petition.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in paragraph No. 2 of the petition, the details of all the other nine cases have been mentioned, which read as under:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Sections	P.S	District	Status of case
1	81	24.07.2012	420, 120-B IPC	Div No.8	Ludhiana	Acquited
2	83	28.07.2012	420, 467, 468,	Div No.8	Ludhiana	Released on



CRM-M-14893-2026

			471, 120-B IPC			probation on 25.11.19
3	103	28.08.2012	420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and 24 of Immigration Act	Div No.8	Ludhiana	Acquitted vide order dated 21.8.19
4	02	16.01.2023	420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and 24 of Immigration Act	Div No.8	Ludhiana	Not related to the petitioner
5	22	17.03.2015	420, 120-B IPC	Div No.8	Ludhiana	Further investigation ordered vide order dated 27.09.2022 no trial
6	23	18.03.2015	420, 120-B IPC	Div No.8	Ludhiana	Discharged vide order dated 22.07.2016
7	104	28.04.2022	420 IPC and 24 of Immigration Act	Div No.5	Ludhiana	Pending already on bail
8	262	03.04.2024	406, 420, 506 IPC and 24 Immigration Act	Assandh	Karnal	Pending already on bail ggranted by Hon’ble HC order 3.12.2025
9	365	19.12.2024	420 IPC and 13 Punjab Travel Profession Act	Div No.7	Ludhiana	Challan no produced-No trial

4. As per the allegations in the present case, complainant-Anil Kumar, was cheated of an amount of Rs. 84,49,000/- under the pretext of arranging travel for his family members to Canada/Australia. An amount of Rs. 26,85,000/- is stated to have been transferred to the bank account of petitioner-Rubina, through Google Pay transactions in the name of Grace Immigration. It is further alleged that the visa was arranged; however, same was found to be fake as per the report submitted by the Australian High Commission, New Delhi.

**CRM-M-14893-2026****3**

5. Without arguing much on merits, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that allegations have been levelled by giving an exaggerated version in the FIR and by inflating the amount actually transferred to the petitioner's bank account through Google Pay. It is further submitted that the allegations are yet to be adjudicated by the learned trial Court upon appreciation of the complete evidence on record. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 23.01.2025 and out of a total of 07 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. Thus, trial is likely to take considerable time, and therefore, the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail.

6. Learned State counsel, while filing the custody certificate, confirms the period of custody of the petitioner. Learned State counsel further submits that petitioner is involved in a serious case of cheating wherein a huge amount has been allegedly defrauded from the complainant on the pretext of arranging foreign travel therefore, no ground for grant of regular bail is made out at this stage

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book alongwith the appended documents.

8. As far as the previously registered cases are concerned, a perusal of the table reproduced hereinabove reveals that in all such cases either the trial is pending, or the petitioner has been acquitted or discharged, and in one case, the final report of investigation has not even been submitted. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, and more particularly for the reason that the offences involved in the present case are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, this Court does not

**CRM-M-14893-2026****4**

find any substantial ground to detain the petitioner any further in judicial custody.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

20.05.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*