



108

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

**CRM-M-19585-2026
DECIDED ON: 09.04.2026**

MANDEEP SINGH**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Vikrampreet Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.0042, dated 19.02.2026, under Sections 318(4) of BNS (corresponding to section 420 IPC), registered at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala.
2. FIR in question has been registered at the instance of complainant namely Dalvir Singh, which reads as under:-

“Sir That I am Dalbir Singh son of Mr. Harchand Singh resident of House No. 162, Dev Nagar, Dhakansoo Road Rajpura, District Patiala, I request as follows. 1. That I am a permanent resident of the above address. Earlier I used to work as a liquor contractor and property and now I am agriculturist. 2. The above-mentioned Mandeep Singh has known me for the last 7 years, this person often used to meet me, due to which I started trusting him. About two years ago, I talked to him about getting a US visa for myself, then the above-mentioned Mandeep Singh told me that a special person of mine only works in sending people out of country and he is a very good and trustworthy person and he will legally get my US tourist visa for a total of Rs. 7,00,000/-. Out of which

Rs. 2,00,000/- has to be paid in advance and the rest of the money he will take after the visa is issued. Hearing this. I trusted him and gave him my passport, Rs. 2,00,000/- in cash and some other necessary documents at my house in the presence of one of my friends Gurcharan Singh Contractor. 3. After some time he said that now your visa is about to be issued and my man is asking for Rs. 2,00,000/- which he has to give to him and the remaining amount has to be given when the visa is issued. I said that earlier he had agreed to give Rs. 2,00,000/- why is he asking for more money before the visa is issued. Then Mandeep Singh told me that you should trust me, if your visa is not issued then I will be responsible for giving you every penny. On which I gave Rs. 2,00,000/- more cash to the said Mandeep Singh. At this time also, one of my friends Baldev Singh was present with me. 4. That after this I kept asking Mandeep Singh about his work, he kept avoiding me with various excuses and when I told him that if my visa is not approved then return the money and the passport for which you had taken responsibility, then Mandeep Singh kept cursing me till now and most of the times he has stopped answering my phone. 5. That the said Mandeep Singh has cheated me of Rs. 4,00,000/- in the name of sending me abroad and now he is not returning my passport either. On the contrary, he is threatening me that he will return me my money and passport when he will get the same and if I harass him more by asking for my money, then I will have to face consequences beyond my imagination. 6. That I can present all the documents and witnesses in front of you in front of which the above-mentioned Mandeep Singh was discussed to send me out. Therefore, by submitting this application, I request you to take appropriate legal action against the above-mentioned Mandeep Singh who has cheated me of Rs. 4,00,000/- and return my passport. SD/-”

3. On oral request, complainant namely Dalvir Singh son of Harchand Singh, resident of House No.162, Dev Nagar Dhakansoo Road, Rajpura, District Patiala, is hereby ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2 in the present petition.

4. Let amended memo of parties be filed by counsel for the petitioner, in the Registry, within a period of two working days from today, without moving any separate application.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that a concocted and belated version has been introduced in the complaint, without specifying the date or circumstances under which the alleged amount was paid to the petitioner by the complainant for the purpose stated therein.

It is further argued that, even if the allegations are assumed to be correct, the amount in question was allegedly paid in the year 2024, whereas the complaint has been filed for the first time in the year 2026, that too, without any substantive proof.

6. It is further submitted that petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and to fully cooperate with the investigating agency, if he is granted protection from arrest by this Court. Thus, learned counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

7. Notice of motion.

8. On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, appears on behalf of the respondent—State, and Mr. Lalit Singla, Advocate, appears on behalf of respondent No. 2/complainant.

9. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that, as per the inquiry conducted by the police following the filing of the complaint, it has emerged that complainant withdrew an amount of Rs.2,00,000/- on

10.10.2024; and another Rs.2,00,000/- on 14.11.2024, from his bank account, which was thereafter allegedly handed over to the petitioner in cash.

10. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record available before it.

11. *Prima facie*, this Court finds merit in the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner. Considering that petitioner and respondent No.2 were admittedly working as wine contractors, ordinary prudence would suggest that a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- would have been transferred through banking channels, rather than being withdrawn in cash on separate occasions and handed over. However, this observation shall not be construed as a conclusive opinion of this Court, as the matter ultimately depends upon the outcome of the investigation and appreciation of the evidence by the trial Court, in case, a *challan* is presented against the petitioner.

12. Be that as it may, in the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find it necessary to keep the present petition pending any further and, accordingly, deems it appropriate to dispose of the same, with the direction to the petitioner to join the investigation within two weeks from today or as and when called by the investigating officer, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the

conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

13. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

14. With the directions recorded here above, present petition stands disposed of.

09.04.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>