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

Sr. No.103

**CRM-M-15929-2026
Date of Decision: 06.04.2026**

PREETPAL SINGH ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA ....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Dr. Mewa Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

*****

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present is the first petition for grant of anticipatory bail filed under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 438 Cr.P.C.) in case bearing FIR No. 52 dated 02.02.2026, registered under Section 420 IPC (Section 318(4) BNS) at Police Station Krishna Gate, Thanesar, District Kurukshetra, Haryana.

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR has been registered on the complaint of Sumit Kumar son of Ram Kumar, who alleged that the petitioner Preetpal Singh represented to him that his brother was residing in Canada and running a restaurant there. It was further represented that if the complainant wanted to send his relatives to Canada through legal means, the same could be arranged for a sum of ₹25,00,000/- per person. Acting upon such representation, the complainant sold his property on 18.10.2023 and paid an amount of ₹25,00,000/- to the petitioner for sending his brother, sister-in-law (Bhabhi) and niece (Bhatiji) to Canada. However, the petitioner

allegedly failed to fulfill the promise. A panchayat was convened wherein the petitioner again assured that he would either send the said persons abroad or return the amount. In furtherance thereof, the petitioner issued a cheque of ₹7,00,000/- in the name of his mother to the complainant, but the remaining amount was not returned. On these allegations, the present FIR came to be registered against the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is argued that the allegations in the FIR are fabricated and have been levelled with an ulterior motive to extort money. It is further contended that the petitioner is not engaged in any business of sending persons abroad and, in fact, had business dealings with the complainant in relation to purchase of bricks, as the complainant is running a brick kiln. The cheque of ₹7,00,000/- was stated to have been issued merely as a security in the course of such business transactions. It is further submitted that the petitioner has already made substantial payments to the complainant through cash as well as online transactions and that the complainant has misused the security cheques. Learned counsel has also argued that the dispute, if any, is purely civil in nature and no criminal liability is made out. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, has not been served with any notice under Section 35 of BNSS, and is ready to join the investigation.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, Mr. Kapil K. Rana, who has filed his *vakalatnama*, which is taken on record, opposed the present application and submitted that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is argued that

the petitioner induced the complainant on the pretext of sending his relatives abroad and obtained an amount of ₹25,00,000/- from him. However, neither did the petitioner send the persons abroad nor did he return the amount. It is contended that the petitioner has cheated the complainant under the garb of facilitating travel abroad and has misappropriated the money. It is further submitted that the petitioner has not cooperated with the investigation and that recovery of the cheated amount is yet to be effected, for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary. Thus, prayer has been made for dismissal of the anticipatory bail application.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. The allegations against the petitioner are of serious nature involving cheating of a substantial amount of ₹25,00,000/- on the false pretext of sending the complainant's relatives abroad. The material on record *prima facie* indicates that the petitioner induced the complainant and received the amount but failed to fulfill his promise. The defence sought to be raised by the petitioner that the transaction was of a civil nature or related to business dealings cannot be accepted at this stage in view of the specific and categorical allegations in the FIR. The recovery of the cheated amount is yet to be effected and the role of the petitioner requires thorough investigation. In such circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears to be necessary for effective investigation and for unearthing the entire modus operandi.

6. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the nature of the offence and the requirement of custodial interrogation, this Court does not

find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present application stands dismissed.

7. However, nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

06.04.2026
Anu

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