



CRM-M-27478-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

102

**CRM-M-27478-2026
Decided on: 15.05.2026**

ISHA DHINGRA**.....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Jangjit Singh Dahiya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.148 dated 05.06.2020 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 420, 468, 471, 506, 34, 120-B and 511 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short - 'the IPC') and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Sector 13-17, Panipat.

2. On 05.06.2020, complainant Gurmeet Singh made a police complaint that in April 2019, the present petitioner allured the complainant via Facebook that the petitioner is instrumental in sending people to Canada and she along with co-accused, namely, Aakash is in the business of sending people abroad. Believing the petitioner, the complainant paid an amount of Rs.15 lakh to the petitioner and co-accused Arun Dhingra. Thereafter, visa and air tickets were given to the complainant which were found to be forged.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case, as she is merely a salaried employee in the office of accused, namely, Akash and Sameer. It is further submitted that a compromise has been effected with the complainant and that the complainant has no objection in case the petitioner is granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, put in appearance and accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner while submitting that there are serious allegations of forgery qua the present petitioner; that a visa was given to the complainant, which, during investigation has been found to be forged and fabricated and after due verification from the competent authorities. It is further contended that the petitioner has played an effective role in the commission of alleged offence and she actively remained in contact with the complainant and also received an amount of Rs.5 lakh in her bank account, and as such, the contentions raised by learned counsel by the petitioner that she is merely an employee of the travel agency is not sustainable; she is required for custodial interrogation to know the details of the forged and fabricated document i.e. visa and to unearth other accomplices having nexus with such racket, whereby, innocent persons have been allured on the pretext of sending them abroad and, as such, prayed for dismissal of the present petition.



6. Mr. Sandeep Kumar Tyagi, Advocate, has put in appearance by way of filing *vakalatnama* on behalf of the complainant and admitted the factum of compromise having been arrived at between the parties and submitted that he has no objection in case the petitioner is granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Heard.

8. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the present case and the rival contentions raised on behalf of the parties and that it is not a simple case of cheating, there are allegations of forgery as forged visa for Canada was provided to the complainant which was found to be fake after due verification from the competent authorities; the petitioner also received an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- in her account, therefore the plea that she is merely an employee of accused No.4 and 5 is not sustainable at this stage. As per FIR, the petitioner was in direct contact with the complainant. As such, she is required for custodial interrogation to collect evidence and to crack the case properly regarding involvement of other accused persons in such racket which duped people by providing fake visas. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. In *State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than



a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

10. In view of above, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and, therefore, the same is hereby **dismissed**.

11. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

15.05.2026
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO