

2026.PHHC.047016



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-49211-2025

Manpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	23.03.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	25.03.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	25.03.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. K.K. Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. G.C. Shahpuri, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 451 dated 23.07.2025 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of IPC and Section 24 of Immigration Act at Police Station 32-33, Karnal.

2026.PHHC.047016



2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint made by Mohan Garg, alleging that about two years back, he came into contact with the petitioner and co-accused Rajan Chhabra, partners of Fastway Visa Point, Karnal, who while claiming themselves to be engaged in the immigration business, represented to him that they would send him abroad on a work visa and induced him to part with an amount of Rs. 27,26,800/-. The victim, however, was not got issued any work visa. He was sent to Doha on tourist visa through dunky route and from there, he was sent to Spain and France, wherein he was kept in illegal custody and could manage to come back only after issuance of an emergency passport with the help of the police. By alleging that the petitioner and the co-accused had got prepared false and fake documents on the pretext of sending him abroad and had cheated him by causing wrongful loss of money, and also committed fraud with him, the complainant prayed for taking action in the matter. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail, which was dismissed by the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal, vide order dated 21.08.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He did not receive any amount of money from the complainant. The allegations against the petitioner are vague and general in nature. As per the own claim of the complainant, an amount of Rs. 20,00,000/- was given to Ankit. The said Ankit has not been implicated as an accused. An amount of Rs. 9,74,027/- was transferred by the complainant into

2026.PHHC.047016



the account of co-accused Rajan Chhabra and not into his bank account. He is ready to join the investigation. It is further submitted that a settlement has also been arrived at between the complainant and himself, and he has paid an amount of Rs. 10,00,000/- to the complainant. No recovery remains to be effected from him. It is, thus, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. His custodial interrogation is necessary for conducting thorough investigation in the matter. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has very fairly stated that the complainant has received an amount of Rs. 10,00,000/- from the petitioner in cash or by way of cheques post-dated or otherwise and has raised not any serious objection to the allowing of the petition.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner, in connivance with the co-accused, is alleged to have duped the complainant of an amount of about Rs. 27,26,800/- on the premise of getting a work visa issued for the complainant and sending him abroad. The petitioner has claimed that he has settled the matter with the complainant, and the complainant's counsel has also not disputed this fact. This Court is not required to go into the details of the compromise which is stated to have been arrived at between the parties for the purpose of disposal

2026.PHHC.047016



of this petition. However, given the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner and the circumstances peculiar to the case, it is held that pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required, and a case for allowing the petition is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted on bail. The petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating/Arresting Officer to join investigation within fifteen days from today and subsequent also as and when required. In the event of his arrest, the Investigating/Arresting Officer shall release the petitioner on bail on furnishing personal/surety bonds to his/her satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNS.

8. It is further clarified that the observations made above are only for the purpose of consideration of application for pre-arrest bail and the same shall not in any manner influence the trial. The trial Court shall consider the case on its merits and without being influenced by this order.

9. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application if any is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

25th March, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |