



CRM-M-61596-2025

-1-

**243 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-61596-2025**

Date of Decision: 14.01.2026

Palwinder Singh Dhillon @ Jaswinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. G.K. Mann, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Anmol Jeevan S. Gill, Advocate,
Ms. Shruti, Advocate and
Mr. Arshjot S. Mohi, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.24 dated 22.09.2020, registered under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station State Cyber Crime, Phase-4, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Manpreet Kaur. It was alleged that she came into contact with a boy, namely, Palwinder Singh (petitioner) on Facebook. He allured her saying that he is working in American Embassy and he could arrange study visa for Canada for her. As the complainant was interested, she talked to him and deal was struck for an amount of Rs.12 lacs for getting her visa for Canada. On asking of Palwinder Singh, she gave him a total amount of Rs.9 lacs, however, neither the visa was provided to her nor money was returned to her. Thus, finding herself cheated, she made a request to take legal action against the accused



person. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 11.07.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar (Duty) (Mohali) praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 05.09.2024. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court for grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-59231-2024, however, the same was dismissed as not pressed vide order dated 05.08.2025. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned Senior counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She has submitted that the complainant, after having lodged the present FIR, shifted abroad and from the last five years, she is residing abroad. It is submitted that despite having been granted various opportunities, she has not appeared before the trial Court for her examination. She submits that though the petitioner is involved in two other cases, however, he is on bail in those cases. She further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars from the last 1½ years, however, there is no material progress in the trial and thus, his right of speedy trial has been miserably defeated. She, thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently controverted



the submissions made by learned Senior counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that there are not only specific allegations against the petitioner, but the transaction of money also took place exclusively with the petitioner. On instructions, he submits that out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, 10 witnesses are yet to be examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested on 11.07.2024. As evident from the zimini orders placed before this Court, the complainant is residing abroad from the last five years and is not appearing before the trial Court for her examination. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 05 months & 30 days as on 12.01.2026. It further shows that the petitioner is facing prosecution in two more cases, however, he is on bail in those cases.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned Senior counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.



CRM-M-61596-2025

-4-

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

	(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)	
	JUDGE	
14.01.2026	Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
sharmila	Whether Reportable :	Yes/No