



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103+133

Date of decision: 05.03.2026

CRM-M-54575-2025

JASVINDER SINGHPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CRM-M-1216-2026

RAJNEESH MEHLA ALIAS RAJNISH KUMARPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CRM-M-7826-2026

SUSHIL KUMAR @ BHINDIPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Pragyat Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-54575-2025.

Mr. T.P.S. Makkar, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-1216-2026 & CRM-M-7826-2026.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Suraj Mandhan, Advocate for the complainant
in all the cases.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. These three petitions, arising out of the same case for seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 0354 dated 03.09.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 316(2), 308(2), 143(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 24 of Emigration Act at Police Station Pundri, District Kaithal, are being decided by a common order.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the basis of complaint submitted by Bharat son of Anil Kumar, resident of Village Fatehpur Pundri, District Kaithal. The allegations levelled in the FIR reads thus:-

“To, The Respected Superintendent of Police, District Kaithal. Subject: Complaint for taking legal action against 1. Rinku Mehla s/o Om Prakash Mehla, resident of village Mundri, District Kaithal Mobile No. 351920345208 2. Jaswinder Singh alias J.P., resident of Pehowa, District Kurukshetra, Mobile No. 4366565675008 3. Vineet Kumar alias Honey, resident of Lakhnauri, District Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh, Mobile No. of 8791917178 4. Rajneesh Mehla, resident of village Mundri, District Kaithal, Mobile No. 9802122601 5. Sushil alias Bhindi, Mobile No. 9992608885. Respected Ma'am, the complainant submits the following 1. That the complainant, Bharat, son of Anil Kumar, is a resident of village Fatehpur Pundri, District Kaithal, and a law-abiding citizen. 2. In November 2024, the complainant was lured into a premeditated criminal conspiracy by the accused, who offered false hopes of a better life and a bright future and promised safe passage abroad. In this regard, a family acquaintance, Paras Walia, introduced the complainant's father to a person named Rinku Mehla,

a resident of village Mundri, District Kaithal, who was allegedly in the business of sending people abroad through a safe and legitimate process. Paras Walia arranged a conversation between the complainant's father and Rinku Mehla, during which Rinku Mehla assured them that he would take Rs.57 lakhs after the complainant safely reached America. 3. A few days later, the accused arranged a visa for the complainant to Dubai, and on November 17th, 2024, the complainant was sent to Dubai via Sharjah and the accused demanded Rs.4 lakhs from the complainant's family. The family paid Rs.2 lakhs in cash to accused no. 4, Rajneesh Mehla, at his residence in village Mundri, District Kaithal, through Paras Walia, at the behest of Rinku Mehla. A few days later, Rinku Mehla called and demanded another Rs.2 lakhs, which was paid on 18.12.2024 to accused no. 3, Vineet Kumar alias Honey, in a Verna car bearing no. UP-11BZ-6474 on Dhand Road, Pundri, District Kaithal, as instructed by Rinku Mehla. 4. The complainant was held in Dubai for 30 days and was subsequently taken by the accused through Tel Aviv, Israel, to Madrid Barajas Airport in Spain, where he was held for four days. A fake Canadian visitor visa was arranged, after which the complainant was taken to Managua, Nicaragua, via Guatemala, and then transported to Mexico via illegal routes. 5. In Mexico, the complainant was tortured by local "dackars" (touts/agents) acting on behalf of the accused, who pressured the complainant's family to pay the full amount. On 28.12.2024, accused no. 1, Rinku Mehla, and accused No. 2-Jaswinder Singh, called and threatened to kill the complainant. Accused no. 2, Jaswinder Singh, sent a voice note via WhatsApp stating, "Your family is causing trouble regarding the payment. If the payment isn't made today, see what happens next." On 03.01.2025, accused no. 1, Rinku Mehla, sent a

WhatsApp message to Paras Walia demanding payment and threatening to stop the complainant's food and water, saying, "Will you speak something, or should I message the dackars?" Under this mental duress, the complainant's father and Paras Walia paid Rs.34 lakhs to accused no. 1, Rinku Mehla, and accused no. 5, Sushil alias Bhindi, on 04.01.2025. This payment was made on Dhand Road in a black colored Scorpio car bearing no. T1124HR0751CY. Following this, accused no. 1, Rinku Mehla, sent a WhatsApp message stating that Rs.9,500 was short. This amount was then paid to accused no. 5, Sushil alias Bhindi, at Guru Brahmanand Chownk, Pundri, District Kaithal. 6. A few days later, on 08.01.2025, an additional Rs.1 lakh was paid by Paras Walia to accused no. 4, Rajneesh Mehla, at his residence in Mundri, after further pressure from Rinku Mehla. 7. Despite the complainant and his family having paid a total of Rs.39 lakhs, the accused failed to get the complainant to America and instead endangered his life. The complainant's family had to arrange a ticket for his return to India at their own expense on 09.03.2025. 8. The accused have committed fraud and criminal breach of trust against the complainant. Therefore, it is prayed that, in light of the above facts, strict legal action be taken against the accused, and justice be served to the complainant. Your prompt action would be greatly appreciated."

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) contend that in the present case, a sum of Rs. 34 lakhs is stated to have been paid by the complainant to Rinku Mehla for sending Bharat to U.S. Initially a sum of Rs. 2 lakhs was handed over as an advance and rest of the amount was to be handed over after the complainant reached U.S. As per the investigation conducted, the complainant was taken initially to Dubai where

he stayed for a period of one month and from Dubai he was taken to Israel, Spain and thereafter to Mexico. It is alleged that in Mexico, the complainant was detained and the balance remittances were asked for whereupon the amount of Rs. 29 lakhs was handed over to Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi (Petitioner in CRM-M-7826-2026). Counsel contend that in the said process, there is neither any inducement by the petitioner-Jasvinder Singh and Rajneesh Mehla @ Rajnish Kumar nor they are beneficiary of any transaction in any manner whatsoever. They contend that the only allegation against Jasvinder Singh is to the effect that when the complainant reached Mexico, a voice message was received by the parents of the complainant for the money to be released and that the said message was from Jasvinder Singh. Counsel contend that so far as Rajneesh Mehla is concerned, the only allegation is that on the asking of Rinku Mehla, a sum of Rs. 3 lakhs was purportedly handed over to Rajneesh Mehla. He contends that the petitioner-Rajneesh Mehla has been nominated as an accused only because he is brother of main accused Rinku Mehla. He contends that no inducement, allurements or threat has ever been extended by the said petitioner. Even if the allegations are taken to be true, for the sake of argument, and without considering the same, the petitioner would at best gain to have received the money in trust for and on behalf of Rinku Mehla. He contends that an inquiry was conducted earlier by the police agencies where Rinku Mehla acknowledged having received the entire amount. It is thus contended that by any stretch of imagination, the petitioner-Rajneesh Mehla @ Rajnish Kumar cannot be said to be beneficiary of the said transaction. They contend that there is no pending case against the petitioner(s) of any nature.

4. Counsel for the petitioner -Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi further contends that Rinku Mehla had admitted to have received the entire amount, hence, his custodial interrogation is not necessary. The principal allegations are against Paras Walia and Rinku Mehla-consultant and the petitioner-Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi has no concern.

5. Learned State Counsel on the other hand refers to allegations levelled in the FIR and contends that the voice message was sent by the petitioner-Jasvinder Singh while some amount was received by the petitioner-Rajneesh Mehla @ Rajnish Kumar and a major amount was received by petitioner-Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi.

6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

7. So far as the petitioner-Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi is concerned, the allegations levelled in the FIR specifically reflect that a sum of Rs. 34 lakhs had been received by Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi. He was acting in collusion and close nexus with Rinku Mehla. Hence, his role cannot be said to be at par with co-accused Rajneesh Mehla @ Rajnish Kumar against whom, the possibility of an implication solely on account of his relationship with Rinku Mehla cannot be ruled out. The petitioner-Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi cannot plead the question of false implication on account of a grudge against Rinku Mehla. Besides, substantial amount has been received by the petitioner-Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi and there was no reason for respondent-complainant to nominate the said petitioner in case he was not in active collusion with Rinku Mehla and Paras Walia.

8. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against different accused, the probability of the defence expounded by them, the absence of link evidence reflecting any allurements, extortion or inducement for sending Bharat to U.S. and taking into consideration that the custodial interrogation may not be necessary in the present case as the receipt of amount, during Police investigation, is stated to have been acknowledged by Rinku Mehla, hence, no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner(s), I am of the opinion that petitioner(s) Jasvinder Singh and Rajneesh Mehla @ Rajnish Kumar have made out a *prima facie* case for grant of anticipatory bail while petitioner-Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi, in CRM-M-7826-2026, has not been able to make out a case of false implication, consequently anticipatory bail petitions for **petitioner-Jasvinder Singh in CRM-M-54575-2025 and Rajneesh Mehla @ Rajnish Kumar in CRM-M-1216-2026** are **allowed** while the anticipatory bail petition of petitioner-Sushil Kumar @ Bhindi in **CRM-M-7826-2026 is dismissed**.

9. In the meantime, the **petitioner-Jasvinder Singh in CRM-M-54575-2025 and Rajneesh Mehla @ Rajnish Kumar in CRM-M-1216-2026** are directed to join investigation as and when required by the Investigating Agency. In the event of the said petitioners joining investigation, they shall be admitted to bail by the arresting officer/investigating officer on furnishing of bail bonds by them to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/investigating officer. The said petitioners shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. It is, however, made clear that the petitioner(s) shall continue to join investigation and extend all cooperation to the Investigating Agency. In the event of the petitioner(s) not extending due cooperation, the

prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application for seeking cancellation of the bail granted by this Court.

MARCH 05, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No