



::1::

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

(243)

CRM-M-31762-2026

Date of decision: 02.07.2026

AMIT ARORA @ RACHIT BAJAJ**.... Petitioner****VERSUS****STATE OF UT CHANDIGARH****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present: Mr. Manik Makkar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Masta, APP, U.T., Chandigarh with
Mr. Vivek Dahiya, Advocate.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this third petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0199 dated 16.11.2024 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B, 467, 468, 471 of IPC (corresponding to Sections 316, 318(4), 61(2), 38, 336(3), 340(2) of BNS (Section 406, 467, 468 and 471 IPC deleted later on) at Police Station Central Sector-17, District Chandigarh.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Palakdeep Kaur and reads as under:-

“Respected Sir, Police Station Sector 17C Chandigarh regarding the fraud committed by the travel agent, Sir, request that I am Palakdeep Kaur W/O Navdeep Singh, resident of village Rajgarh, Teh Nabha (Patiala) that on 24.01.2023, I have applied my visa file for Australia at Immigration Solution (my immigration solution) 17C Chandigarh SCO 123-124 IInd floor and the documents asked by then were provided by us and gave them Rs.



::2::

80,000/- in cash on 17.04.2023 and Rs. 15000/- online transaction was deposited in the account on 16.01.2023 (Rachit Bajaj) mobile no. 9876156351. After this, they got deposited Rs 5,27,800/- in their account in the name of college fee. (AC No 201011461350) (IFSC-INDB0001712) (IMMIGRATION SOLUTION) thereafter neither they got us the visa nor they returned our money. Whenever we used to come to their office then they use to misbehave with us and used to threaten us. We hope that our money may be returned from them. Yours faithfully, Sd/- Palakdeep Kaur, Ph. No. 7657887719, 9464287074 date 31.7.24”

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. As the petitioner is in custody since November, 2024 but only 05 of the 25 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, and the case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate, the Trial is not likely to be concluded anytime soon, and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that the petitioner is a habitual offender with 19 other cases of a similar nature pending against him. His first bail application was argued and withdrawn as recently as on March, 2026. There is no change in circumstances entitling him to the concession of bail. Keeping in view his antecedents, there is every possibility that he would abscond from justice in case he is granted the concession of regular bail as prayed for. Therefore, he ought not to be granted the concession of bail

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

6. The allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature. He is a habitual offender with 19 other cases of a similar nature pending against him. There is every possibility that he would abscond from justice in case



::3::

he is granted the concession of bail. As many as 05 of the 25 prosecution witnesses have been examined. Therefore it cannot be stated that there is any undue delay in the conclusion of the Trial.

7. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, I find no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

8. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

02.07.2026
kusum

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