



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

**CRM-M No.28831 of 2026
Date of decision: 25.05.2026**

Sandeep Singh @ Sandeep Hans

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Akbarjit Singh, Advocate (*joined through VC*)
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (under Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0091 dated 18.07.2024, registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC, 1860 [corresponding Sections 316, 318(4) and 61 of the BNS, 2023] and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Goraya, District Jalandhar Rural, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case as well as in the interest of justice. The petitioner further prays that the arrest of the petitioner be stayed during the pendency of the present petition, in the interest of justice.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the present FIR was got registered on the statement of complainant Jagdeep Kumar alleging therein that the petitioner along with co-accused received an amount of Rs.31,56,000/- from the complainant for sending his brother namely Mandeep Kumar as well as his friends namely Hardeep Kumar, Anil Kumar,



Kamaljeet Lal and Rakesh Kumar to Italy. However, neither the aforesaid persons were sent to Italy nor the amount so received by the petitioner and co-accused was returned to the complainant, thereby cheating him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been argued that the petitioner is not working as a travel agent and is, in fact, running a catering business under the name and style of *M/s Hans Catering* and has taken A-One Palace on lease for organizing parties and functions. It has further been contended that the complainant had approached the petitioner for arranging a function and an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- was paid in advance, however, later on, the complainant cancelled the said function and thereafter, due to annoyance, concocted a false story and got the present FIR registered. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and no custodial interrogation is required in the present case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and he has opposed the present petition and argued that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It has been submitted that the petitioner is the main accused in the present case and there are chats/conversations between the petitioner and the complainant regarding sending the aforesaid persons abroad. Learned State counsel has further argued that despite receiving an amount of Rs.31,56,000/-, neither the petitioner sent the aforesaid persons to Italy nor returned the remaining amount to the



complainant. It has thus been contended that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for proper investigation of the case.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record carefully.

7. The allegations levelled in the present FIR are serious in nature. A substantial amount of Rs.31,56,000/- is alleged to have been taken from the complainant and his associates on the pretext of sending them abroad. Cases involving cheating of innocent persons under the guise of providing foreign travel/employment opportunities are on the rise and have serious societal ramifications. *Prima-facie*, the material on record, including the allegations as well as the chats between the parties, indicates the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence. The investigation is still at a nascent stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioner cannot be ruled out at this stage for recovery of the amount and for unearthing the complete modus operandi.

8. In view of the gravity and nature of the allegations, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

10. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

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

25.05.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No