



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

Sr. No.286

CRM-M-19884-2026
Date of Decision: 16.04.2026

MANINDERJIT SINGH @ RINKU

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Pushp Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. N.S. Mahal, DAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 67 dated 11.08.2025, registered under Sections 316(2), 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Sections 406 and 420 IPC), at Police Station Division No. 4, District Police Commissionerate, District Jalandhar, in the interest of justice.

2. As per the prosecution case, the present FIR has been registered on the basis of a complaint made by Amandeep Kaur, wherein it has been alleged that a deal was struck for sending the complainant to America in lieu of an amount of Rs. 43,00,000/-. It is alleged that the said amount was paid to different persons including one Baba Ji and agent Malik; however, the complainant was neither sent abroad nor was the entire amount returned. During the course of investigation, it surfaced that the present petitioner Maninderjit Singh alias Rinku had received an amount of Rs. 10,00,000/-



from co-accused Amandeep Singh and had allegedly delivered the same to agent Malik at Ambala (Haryana) at the instance of Karanjit Singh. It is further alleged that the accused persons, in connivance with each other, duped the complainant on the false pretext of sending her abroad.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he received an amount of Rs. 10,00,000/- from co-accused Amandeep Singh and the said amount was further handed over by him to agent Malik. It is argued that no amount has been retained by the petitioner and no direct transaction has taken place between the complainant and the petitioner. It is further submitted that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner is stated to be ready to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency and, therefore, he deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, has opposed the present petition and filed a status report, stating therein that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is submitted that though no recovery has been effected from the petitioner so far, however, during investigation it has come on record that an amount of Rs. 10,00,000/-, forming part of the cheated amount, was received by the petitioner from co-accused Amandeep Singh and the said amount is yet to be recovered. It is further submitted that efforts are being made to trace the said amount and to verify the financial trail, for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.



5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. The allegations in the present case are serious in nature, involving cheating of a substantial amount from the complainant on the pretext of sending her abroad. Such offences have become rampant, where innocent persons are lured with false promises of immigration and are duped of their hard-earned money. The role attributed to the petitioner is not merely peripheral, as he is alleged to have actively participated in the transaction of the cheated amount. The recovery of the amount and tracing of the financial trail are crucial aspects of the investigation, which necessitate custodial interrogation of the petitioner. In view of the gravity of the allegations and the requirement of effective investigation, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

7. However, it is clarified that nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

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

16.04.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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