



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

135

CRM-M-50353-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 19.02.2026

Rupinder Aujla @Rupinder Ojla

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Nirmal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

Power of Attorney on behalf of the petitioner has been filed.

The same be taken on record.

2. This petition for bail, which is first petition, has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. This petition has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.234 dated 17.06.2024 for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 120-B, 201, 467, 468 and 471 of Indian Penal Code, and Sections 10 & 24 of Immigration Act, Police Station Ladwa, District Kurukshetra.

3. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Ram Kumar', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that his son Harsh Kumar, who was an educated



unemployed youth, having Diploma in hotel management, wanted to settle abroad, and that for that purpose, he wanted a 'Work Permit Visa'. According to complainant, the accused, namely Rupinder Aujla, Paramjeet Kaur and Suresh, were running the office of travel agent and that they had entered into a deal with the complainant to arrange 'Work Visa' for the son of complainant against a sum of Rs.27 lacs, and that the deal was struck and money was paid for sending the son of complainant to Australia, but the above-named accused instead of sending the son of complainant to Australia, sent him to Indonesia, from where he was sent to Malaysia and then ultimately he was returned to Delhi.

4. It was further stated by the complainant that neither his money has been returned by the accused persons, nor his son has been provided with work visa, and thus, he has been cheated.

5. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned complaint, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent, who has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that the petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than one year and three months. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the offence is triable by the Court of



Judicial Magistrate, and that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future.

8. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that in fact it is not the petitioner, who has duped the complainant, rather it was done by Satish Kumar, who had taken Rs.60 lacs from the petitioner in a Panchayati compromise and assured the petitioner to return money to the complainant, but he has failed to do so.

9. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, and the plea of petitioner that he had paid money to co-accused Satish Kumar itself makes it abundantly clear that the petitioner, too, was involved in the abovementioned racket.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. A perusal of record shows that the present case is not the only case pending against the petitioner. Rather, the petitioner has been found involved in the similar kind of offences in five other cases also. There are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner that the petitioner had entered into a deal for arranging 'Work Visa' for the son of complainant, and sent him to Australia, but neither the work visa was made available, nor the son of complainant was sent to Australia, and thus, this plea of learned State Counsel cannot be ignored that right from the very beginning, intention of the petitioner was to commit cheating.



12. It is also pertinent to note here that the allegations contained in the present petition qua the fact that the petitioner had paid Rs.60 lacs to Satish Kumar to satisfy the claim of the petitioner in itself makes it abundantly clear that the petitioner was involved in the abovementioned deal, and that the abovementioned deal has failed.

13. Taking into consideration the abovementioned facts and circumstances of the present case, the past conduct of the petitioner and the gravity of offence committed by the petitioner, it is hereby held that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail and the present petition is devoid of merits and deserves dismissal. The same is hereby *dismissed*, accordingly.

14. However, it is clarified that the abovementioned observations shall not have any bearing upon the merits of the case.

15. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

19.02.2026

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No