



- 1 -

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

204

SANDEEP KUMAR

CRM-M-55743-2025

Date of decision: 08.01.2026

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. J.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Jagsir Singh.Mr. Yogesh Goel, Advocate and
Mr. Lakshay Goel, Advocate for respondent No.2/complainant.YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. This is first petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0007 dated 04.09.2025 registered under Section 420 IPC at Police Station NRI, District Moga.

2. On 10.11.2025, following order was passed:-

“This is first petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0007 dated 04.09.2025 registered under Section 420 IPC at Police Station NRI, District Moga.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner's daughter was married with Ashwin Vashishat who is son of the complainant. His daughter was already studying in Canada and it was agreed that her husband will also be taken to Canada on spouse visa but expenses were to be borne by the family of the husband and a sum of around Rs.22 lakhs was paid from time to time. Petitioner's daughter applied for spouse visa before the Canadian authorities but the spouse visa was rejected on 2-3 occasions for which the petitioner or his daughter cannot be held at fault. The authorities while



- 2-

rejecting the visa observed that the husband's job offer, assets and financial situation are not sufficient to support the stated purpose of travel to Canada. Learned counsel next contended that the marriage is still subsisting and there was no false inducement to the complainant or her son to pay money with a promise to send them abroad. The application was moved for obtaining spouse visa but the same has been rejected. Learned counsel next contended that the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel as well as counsel for the complainant have opposed the bail in view of gravity of offence.

Adjourned to 08.01.2026.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;

iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section."

3. Today learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated



10.11.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

4. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 10.11.2025, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

5. Disposed of.

6. Pending misc application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

08.01.2026
amandeep

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

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