



123

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

**CRM-M No.40550 of 2025
Date of Decision: 18.03.2026**

Balraj Kaur @ Mahi Gill

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Rohit Singla, Advocate and
Mr. Abhay Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0021, dated 08.02.2024, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC and Section 24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Mataur, District SAS Nagar.
2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Manpreet Kaur Grewal wife of Jaswinder Singh Grewal against Nishan Singh, Prabhjot Singh, Samar Sandhu, Priya, Priyanka Avneet, Mahi (petitioner), Preet, Amita, Rishab Thakur, Kulbir Singh and Amandeep Singh. It was alleged that in the month of January, 2021, sister-in-law of complainant, namely, Navneet Kaur visited their house and they went to Gopal Sweets



and were talking about going to Canada to visit their relatives home. Some persons were also sitting on other table. Out of them, 03 girls came to us and disclosed their names to be Priya, Priyanka and Amita and told that they are working in Immigration Firm along with Nishan Singh, Prabhjot Singh and Samar Sandhu on the first floor of Gopal Sweets, Sector 70, Mohali and told them to visit their office if they intended to go to Canada on P.R. basis. The complainant along with her sister-in-law visited the office, where they assured them that they will send them to Canada and they are providing PR through SINIP (Saskatchewan Immigration Nominee Programme) but we have to pay Rs.5 Lacs each and in case the visa was not granted, they will return the amount with interest. It was alleged that sister-in-law of complainant paid an amount of Rs.30,000/- on 08.03.2021; an amount of Rs.2,00,000/- on 19.03.2021 and an amount of Rs.1,50,000/- on 10.08.2021. It was further alleged that the complainant had given an amount of Rs.15,000/- on 12.02.2022; an amount of Rs.15,000/- on 19.02.2022 to Samar Sandhu and thereafter, she again paid an amount of Rs.2,30,000/- to Samar Sandhu. The complainant further paid an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- in cash to Prabhjot Singh and Nishan Singh in May, 2023. It was alleged that in September, 2023, the complainant came to know that number of persons have been duped by the accused persons and they were protesting outside their office. The complainant later on found that no process was initiated by the abovesaid accused persons regarding her and her sister-in-law. The complainant and her husband was also threatened by the accused persons. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against all the accused. On the basis of the



same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 07.11.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan has been presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mohali praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mohali dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 05.06.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that admittedly the petitioner though was the employee of the company, namely, Visa Land owned by co-accused, namely, Nishan Singh. He has submitted that the petitioner was simply the employee of that company and was never aware about the misadventure done by the employee. He has submitted that from the allegations made by the complainant, it is evident that neither the petitioner had met the complainant nor any transaction of the money as alleged had taken place with her. He has submitted that the petitioner only being the employee of the company had verified the documents submitted by the complainant for the preparation of visa. He has submitted that the petitioner, being the employee of the company, has been implicated in 10 other cases, however, she has been released on bail in the same. He has submitted that the investigation is complete and the charges have already been framed. He has submitted that the petitioner is



behind bars from last more than 01 year. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who is involved in 10 more cases. He has submitted that in all there are total 14 accused and out of which, 13 are yet to be arrested. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was the employee of the company, namely, Visa Land, which was owned by Nishan Singh. The petitioner, as submitted before this Court, was only the employee of the company. The allegations regarding alluring the complainant are against the co-accused. Even the payment of the money is also with the co-accused and not with the petitioner. The petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 07.11.2024. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 04 months and 03 days as on 17.03.2026. It further reflects that though the petitioner is involved in 10 other cases, however, as submitted before this Court by learned counsel for the petitioner, she is on bail in those cases. Out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined so far.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after



the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then her further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

18.03.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No