



CRM-M-31934-2025

-1-

(119)

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

CRM-M-31934-2025

Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

PARVINDER ALIAS REHMAT

... Petitioner

Versus**STATE OF PUNJAB**

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDIPresent: Mr. Maneesh Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Ravi Malhotra, Advocate
for the complainant.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.55 dated 19.10.2024 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professional (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Fattu DHINGA, District Kapurthala.

2. The allegations against the petitioner and his co-accused are that they took a sum of Rs.33,50,000/- on the pretext of renewing the passport of Puneet Puri and obtaining permanent residency for him.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The entire transaction is purportedly in cash which cannot be believed. As the petitioner

**CRM-M-31934-2025**

-2-

is in custody since 26.03.2025 but none of the 15 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case 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 along with the learned counsel for the complainant contend the complainant has been cheated a huge amount of money and therefore, the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner does not entitle him to the grant of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 26.03.2025 but none of the 15 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. In the instant case, admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 26.03.2025 but none of the 15 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. There are no serious apprehensions expressed by the State that the petitioner would abscond from justice, tamper with the evidence or

**CRM-M-31934-2025****-3-**

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 on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-Parvinder alias Rehmat S/o Paramjit Singh is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. The petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- 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 petitioner from trial without sufficient cause

10. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

10.03.2026

JITESH

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