



CRM-M-45618-2024

1

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

112

CRM-M-45618-2024

Decided on: 14.01.2026

Palwinder Singh @ Parwinder Singh @ Rahul
Versus

.....Petitioner

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Abhinav Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 76 dated 11.04.2024, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC and Section 13 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur.

2. It is noticed that, vide order dated 07.03.2025, petitioner was released on interim bail, recording as follows:

“1. On 01.03.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.76 dated 11.04.2024, under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC and Section 13 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur.

2. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that as per allegations an amount of Rs.4.5 lacs was received by the petitioner and some of the amount was deposited in the bank account of the wife of the petitioner and he is ready to pay back some of the amount. To show his bonafide, petitioner would produce a demand draft amounting to Rs.1,00,000/-



(Rupees one lac) in the name of the complainant on the date fixed.

3. On oral request of learned counsel for the petitioner, complainant-Rajjat Manhas s/o Late Satpal, resident of Village Pandori Baghel Singh, Police Station Mukerian, District Hoshiarpur, is impleaded as partyrespondent No.2. 4. Let amended memo of parties be filed within three days from today.

5. List on 07.03.2025.

6. The Station House Officer concerned is directed to ensure the presence of the complainant before this Court on the next date of hearing.”

2. Today, instead of the demand draft for the amount of Rs.1,00,000/-, counsel for the petitioner has handed over demand draft No.796091, dated 06.03.2025, of Punjab National Bank, amounting to Rs. 70,000/-, to the complainant, who is present in Court, along with the police official – ASI Harminster Singh. A photocopy of the said demand draft is taken on record.

3. In order to honour the statement recorded by counsel for the petitioner as per order dated 01.03.2025, and upon the request made by him, additional time is granted to comply with the said order.

4. The petitioner is directed to be released on interim bail, uptill 19.03.2025, i.e. the next date of hearing fixed before this Court, to allow him time to arrange the amount payable to the complainant, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

5. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.



6. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

7. List again on 19.03.2025.”

3. Thereafter, concession of interim bail was continued. Since respondent No. 2 failed to appear despite being duly served, following order was passed on 28.10.2025:

“1. As reflecting in the order dated 07.03.2025, complainant/respondent No.2, was present in the Court along with ASI Harminder Singh and on that day, demand draft of Rs.70,000/- was paid to him. However, on the next date of hearing, neither the complainant/respondent No.2 was present, nor there was any representation on behalf of him, before this Court. However, contention of learned counsel for the petitioner was recorded that an amount of Rs.33,000/- has also been transferred by him in the Bank account of complainant/respondent No.2. Thereafter, complainant has never appeared before this Court.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e., 27.08.2025, the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. However, the same has been returned with a report stating that, due to the absence of the parties, the case is being sent back to the High Court as a non-starter case.

3. In view of the above, the proceedings are deferred once again to 14.01.2026. 14.01.2026

The concerned SHO, within whose jurisdiction complainant/respondent No.2 resides, is directed to inform this Court on the next date of hearing, after confirming from complainant/respondent No.2 whether he is willing to settle the dispute with the petitioner or not ?

Interim order to continue till then.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

**CRM-M-45618-2024****4**

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Jaspal Singh, informed that respondent No. 2/complainant Rajjat Manhas has not been residing in India for the past 7–8 months and is settled in Slovakia. A report in this regard was produced in Court today and same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the report appropriately in the paper-book.

5. In view of the circumstances explained above, order dated 07.03.2025, whereby interim bail was granted to the petitioner, is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition stands allowed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

14.01.2026
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**