



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36685-2025

JARNAIL SINGHPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARESPONDENT

CRM-M-52380-2025

ANANDPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHERRESPONDENTS

DECIDED ON: 17.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Govind Chauhan, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-52380-2025), and
Mr. Sham Lal Saha, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-36685-2025).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. By this common order, both the aforementioned petitions,
i.e. CRM-M-36685-2025 and CRM-M-52380-2025 shall stand disposed
of.

2. Prayer in these petitions, filed under Section 482 of the
BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail



to the petitioners, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Anand, aged about 34 years, and Jarnail Singh, aged about 48 years	192	10.06.2025	318(4), 316(2), 3(5) of BNS and Section 24 of Immigration Act	Matlauda	Panipat

3. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 17.09.2025, following order was passed in CRM-M-52380-2025:-

“2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that as per the allegations, an amount of Rs.12 lacs was paid by the complainant, to the petitioner and co-accused namely Sunil, for the purpose of sending the complainant to Hong Kong.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, as the allegations against him are vague and bald. It is submitted that there is no transaction involving the alleged amount with the petitioner, nor any amount has been received by the petitioner, either in cash or through any bank transaction.

Additionally, counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused, namely Sunil Kumar and Jarnail Singh, have already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, *vide* orders dated 17.07.2025 (passed in CRM-M-37646-2025) and 15.07.2025 (passed in CRM-M-36885-2025). Moreover, petitioner is ready to join the investigation and fully cooperate, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.



6. *Adjourned to 06.11.2025.
To be heard along with CRM-M-36685-2025.*

7. *Meanwhile, petitioner shall not be arrested. However, issue of joining of investigation by the petitioner would be examined on the next date of hearing, after reviewing the status report, which is yet to be filed by learned State counsel.”*

4. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 15.07.2025, following order was passed in CRM-M-36685-2025:-

“2. As per the allegations, an amount of Rs. 12 lacs was paid by the complainant to co-accused, namely Sunil and Anand, for the purpose of sending the complainant to Hong Kong.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only allegation against the petitioner is that, he acted as a middleman and took responsibility for the said deal. However, there is no specific allegation or evidence to suggest that any amount was paid directly to the petitioner. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency, accordingly, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

3. *Notice of motion.*

On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, Haryana puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State. He seeks some time to file reply.

4. *Learned State counsel is directed to file status report explaining therein the allegations and evidence against the petitioner.*

5. *Adjourned to 21.08.2025.*

6. *Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioner joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondent/State.”*

5. Continuing the submissions, learned counsel for the respective petitioners contends that allegations are entirely false and baseless. It is submitted that there is not an iota of evidence to show that



any amount was deposited in the bank accounts of the petitioners, either through online transactions or by way of cheque.

It is further argued that it has become a common practice to give a criminal colour to purely financial disputes, with FIRs being lodged as a means to recover money, even in the absence of any concrete evidence of any promise having been made by the accused persons to send the complainants abroad.

5. Counsel for the petitioners jointly submit that both the petitioners are ready to join the investigation and fully cooperate, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, they pray for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the present case.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant could not point any evidence or document to substantiate that an amount of Rs.12 lacs, or any part thereof, was ever transferred through bank transactions. However, they pray for dismissal of the present petitions.

7. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it, and deems it appropriate to dispose of the present petitions, by directing both the petitioners to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioners would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also be abide by all the conditions



laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

8. Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.

9. With the directions issued here above, both the present petitions stand disposed of.

10. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

17.03.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>