



280

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

CRM-M No.17429 of 2026

Date of Decision: 09.04.2026

Amit Kumar**..... Petitioner**

Versus

State of Haryana**..... Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

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

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Senior DAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present third petition praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.148 dated 19.03.2025, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of IPC (Sections 316(2), 318(4), 61(2) of BNS) and Section 24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Assandh, District Karnal.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant, namely, Kuldeep Singh. It was alleged that in the month of June, 2022, two persons, namely, Jasbir Singh and William Kumar, met him and represented that they were engaged in sending people abroad for employment and induced him to go to America for earning money. It was alleged that they demanded a total amount of Rs.60,00,000/- and assured that the complainant can pay in installments. It was further alleged that the complainant was sent to Dubai on the assurance of sending him to Mexico on direct flight from Dubai, but later on was called back on false pretext. It was alleged that the complainant has paid about Rs.13,00,000/- through bank



transactions and additional amounts, including Rs.20,00,000/- in cash, on different occasions. It was further alleged that one day, the accused persons called the complainant to Hotel-A, Jalandhar and when the complainant went there with his friend Ashish Kumar, they introduced him to a person who worked as a Financer, namely, Amit Kumar (present petitioner). It was also alleged that the complainant met Jasbir Singh and Amit Kumar there and took Rs.20,00,000/- cash from him. It was further alleged that despite repeated assurances, no work was done and the abovesaid accused persons kept delaying the matter, thereby cheating the complainant of substantial money. Hence, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. Thus, the FIR was registered and investigation commenced and petitioner was arrested on 28.06.2025. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 27.02.2025. Thereafter, petitioner earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M-57296-2025 and CRM-M-73725-2025, however, the same were declined vide orders dated 17.10.2025 and 23.01.2026, respectively. Hence, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present third petition praying for grant of regular bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case on the pretext of sending the complainant to America. He has submitted that the complainant has levelled false allegations against the petitioner that he has given Rs.56,00,000/- to the accused persons, especially, to the petitioner. He has submitted that as alleged by the



complainant, he took a direct flight to Mexico from Dubai however, he returned to India from Dubai after 6-7 days. He has submitted that the arrival and departure dates have not been provided by the complainant either in the FIR or even after registration of the FIR. He has submitted that the complainant has not even paid a single penny to any of the accused mentioned in the FIR till the date of his travel to and even after returning from Dubai. He has submitted that the petitioner was introduced to the complainant by one Jasbir Singh, who is engaged in the business of finance. He has submitted that the complainant himself stated that since, he did not know the petitioner, he refused to give any payment to him. He has submitted that FIR No.62 dated 29.01.2023, under Section 24 of Emigration Act, 1983 and Sections 406, 420, 506 of IPC at Police Station Assandh, District Karnal was registered against the complainant of present case, namely, Kuldeep, on the pretext of sending Vikas to USA via Europe by duping Rs.55,00,000/- from him and in same case, Kuldeep remained in jail for about 04 months. He has submitted that co-accused of petitioner, namely, William Kumar Sabharwal, has already been granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 22.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-37849-2025 by this Court. He has relied upon the judgment titled as *Arvind Walia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement and another* passed in CRWP-8667-2025 decided on 29.01.2026. He thus, has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner in conspiracy with other co-accused has duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.56,00,000/- on the pretext of sending him abroad. She has submitted that the petitioner has committed a grave and serious offence of

cheating and fraud with the complainant in connivance with other accused persons which affects the general public and society at large. She has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner. She, on instructions, submits that challan has been filed, charges have been framed and out of 17 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. She thus, has submitted that no case for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner in connivance with other accused persons, duped the complainant for huge amount, on the pretext of sending him abroad. As submitted, challan has been presented, charges are framed and out of 17 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon Arvind Walia's case (supra), however, the same is distinguishable from the facts of the present case.

6. Keeping in view the above said position, this Court does not find any ground to release the petitioner on bail, at this stage. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

09.04.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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