



::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(218) CRM-M-21236-2026
Date of decision: 11.05.2026

HARMEET SINGHPetitioner
V/s
STATE OF PUNJAB ...Respondent
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Toor, AAG Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile under Section 439 Cr.P.C.) is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.30 dated 23.02.2024 under Sections 420 IPC (318(4) of BNS) and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act (Sections 465 (336(2) of BNS), 467 (338 of BNS), 468 (336(3) of BNS) and 471 IPC (340(2) of BNS) added later on) registered at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur.

2. As per the allegations levelled, the petitioner has received a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- from the complainant to send him abroad.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. There is no evidence available inculcating the petitioner. As he is in custody since 29.12.2025 but none of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon, and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.



::2::

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, has filed a reply dated 10.05.2026, which is taken on record. While referring to the said reply, he contends that the petitioner is a serial offender. One other case emanating out of FIR No.135 dated 22.05.2020 under Sections 406, 420 IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act stands registered against him, where the allegations are similar to the allegations levelled in the present case. Therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail as prayed for. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 29.12.2025 and that none of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. This Court in the case titled as ***Maninder Sharma Vs. State Tax Officer, State, Mobile Wing, Jalandhar, Punjab bearing CRM-M24033-2021(O&M) Decided on 31.08.2022*** has held as under:-

“Therefore, broadly speaking (subject to any statutory restrictions contained in Special Acts) , in economic offences involving the IPC or Special Acts or cases triable by Magistrates once the investigation is complete, final report/complaint filed and the triple test is satisfied then denial of bail must be the exception rather than the rule. However, this would not prevent the Court from granting bail even prior to the completion of investigation if the facts so warrant.”

7. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 29.12.2025 but none of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the



::3::

present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. The present case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate and no serious apprehension has been expressed by the State that the petitioner would abscond from justice, tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses if granted the concession of bail. Therefore, in this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

8. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Harmeet Singh is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other crime other than the present one.

10. The petitioner (or anyone on their behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.2,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioners from trial without sufficient cause.

11. The present petition stands disposed of.

12. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

May 11, 2026
kusum

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

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