2026:PHHC:027323

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

126

CRM-M-51371-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 20.02.2026

Parmod **...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Haryana **...Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Manu Singh Sheokhand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. *(Oral)*

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0275 dated 14.10.2024, registered under Section 24 of the Emigration Act, 1983 and Sections 3(5), 316(2) and 318(4) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petitions are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by complainant Amit on 14.10.2024 alleging therein that accused Subhash and Seema, who were his uncle and maternal aunt respectively, arranged his meeting with accused Rakesh, Sunita and Parmod (petitioner). Accused Rakesh is the son-in-law of his maternal aunt, accused Sunita is his

cousin and the petitioner Parmod is the grandson of his maternal aunt and was stated to be residing in Singapore. He further alleged that in June 2024, accused Subhash and Seema visited the complainant and taking advantage of family relations and the illness of the complainant's father, induced him with the assurance of sending him abroad for employment on a work permit. It was represented that the complainant would first be sent to Malaysia for medical examination and thereafter would be granted a visa for Singapore, particularly as the petitioner was already settled there. Believing the assurances, the complainant transferred Rs. 15,000/- to the petitioner through UPI on 13.08.2024. Thereafter, accused Subhash took Rs. 2 Lakhs in cash from the complainant's house. On 02.09.2024 and thereafter, the complainant transferred and arranged payment of various amounts through UPI, RTGS and cash, thereby parting with a total sum of Rs. 16,46,541/- at the instance of the accused persons. The complainant further stated that on 18.09.2024, he travelled from Delhi to Malaysia, where he stayed for 4-5 days and underwent medical examination after paying Rs. 50,000/- to one Jimmy. He was informed that his medical report would be emailed to the concerned company and that he would shortly receive a job and visa for Singapore. Three other persons, namely Harjinder Punia, Amit Choudhary and Ravi Khoth, were also accompanying the complainant and were similarly assured of Singapore visas.

3. As per the further allegations, on 25.09.2024, the petitioner informed the complainant that he would have to return to India and that he would get a direct visa and flight to Singapore within two hours of reaching India. Acting on this assurance, the complainant and others returned to India on 25.09.2024, but neither any visa nor any onward flight was arranged. Subsequently, on

27.09.2024, the accused persons again assured the complainant of a flight from Delhi to Singapore the next day, which also did not materialise. While alleging that the accused persons, including the petitioners, in furtherance of their conspiracy, cheated the complainant and misappropriated a total amount of Rs. 11,00,000/-, the complainant prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 02.07.2025. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the subject crime and got recovered a sum of Rs.3,05,000/- apart from a passport and some mobile phones/SIM cards. He also disclosed that one Sandeep, who was running an immigration business at Fatehabad in the name of Yayaver Emigration, had given him a bank account number in which, he got deposited an amount of Rs.5 Lakhs from complainant. The said account was found to be in the name of co-accused Naveen. Accordingly, he was also nominated in this case as an accused and was arrested on 13.08.2025. Some other persons were also nominated in this case. Investigation now stands completed and challan has been filed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner himself had gone to Singapore in September, 2024 on a work visa through above mentioned Sandeep, who was running immigration business. The complainant, being a relative of the petitioner, approached the parents of the petitioner and thereafter contacted the petitioner, who merely disclosed the name of the said visa agent and had no further role in the matter. The complainant and three other persons independently dealt with the visa agent Sandeep and all payments were made by the complainant on the directions of the said agent. An amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- was transferred to the

account of Kisan Beej Bhandar, owned by petitioner Naveen, and other amounts were also transferred as per the instructions of the visa agent. The complainant transferred Rs. 2,70,000/- to the petitioner, which was immediately forwarded by the petitioner to the account provided by the visa agent, without any personal benefit. The petitioner has no connection whatsoever with co-accused Naveen. During investigation, co-accused Naveen, in his disclosure statement dated 13.08.2025, had categorically stated that he did not know the petitioner. There is no relationship or call details between the petitioner and co-accused. Even otherwise, investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time as only 02 out of total 14 witnesses have been examined so far. Co-accused Sunita, Seema Devi, Rakesh and Subhash, against whom there were graver allegations, have been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. The petitioner is in custody since long. On parity, he too deserves to be given the same benefit. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

5. Status report along with the custody certificate of the petitioner has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has argued that the allegations against the petitnoer are specific and serious in nature. He had induced the complainant to deposit aforesaid amount of money in the account provided by co-accused Sandeep. Trial is going on at a proper pace. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding or influencing the prosecution witnesses, if released on bail. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner along with other co-accused is alleged to have induced the complainant to part with a huge amount of money on the pretext of arranging a work visa for Singapore and facilitated deposit of money in bank accounts allegedly linked with the co-accused, thereby cheating the complainant and misappropriating the amount in question. Though the allegations make out a prima facie case for commission of alleged offences against the petitioner, however, a perusal of the record reveals that he is no longer required for custodial interrogation. The trial is still at an initial stage, as only 2 out of 14 prosecution witnesses have been examined and its conclusion is likely to take considerable time. Co-accused, namely Sunita, Seema Devi, Rakesh and Subhash, against whom direct and comparatively serious allegations have been levelled, have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. The petitioner, therefore, is entitled to the benefit of parity. At this stage, the material on record does not conclusively establish that the petitioner was the main beneficiary of the alleged transactions or that he was independently running any immigration business. The petitioner is in custody since 02.07.2025. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds by two sureties to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and on the following conditions:-

(i) the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case in any manner whatsoever.

(ii) he shall deposit his passport with the learned trial Court and shall not leave the country under any circumstance without permission of the learned trial Court.

(iii) he shall appear before the learned trial Court as and when directed.

(iv) he shall provide his address where he would be residing after release and shall not change the same without informing the concerned IO/SHO.

(v) the petitioner shall upon his release give his mobile phone number to concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switched on all times.

8. In the event of there being any FIR/complaint lodged against the petitioner, it shall be open to the respondent to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.

9. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

20.02.2026 **(MANISHA BATRA)**
Waseem Ansari **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*
Whether reportable *Yes/No*